



Excerpt of
Livestream Video Recording

South Carolina Public Service Commission
Advisory Council Meeting

6/14/2019

In Re: House Bill 3659

COPY

Southern Reporting, Inc.
Phone: 803.749.8100
Fax: 803.749.9991
Email: Depos@southernreporting.net

Transcript of
South Carolina Public Service Commission
Advisory Council Meeting Excerpt
Via Livestream Video Recording
In Re: House Bill 3659

- - - - -

Date Recorded June 14, 2019

Transcribed by: Audrey S. Beebe,
Southern Reporting, Inc

Meeting Participants:

K. Chad Burgess, Esq.
Robert R. Smith, II, Esq.
J. Blanding Holman, IV, Esq.
Carrie H. Grundmann, Esq.
Jeffrey M. Nelson, Esq.
Dawn M. Hipp
Scott Elliott, Esq.
Hamilton Davis, Esq.
James H. Goldin, Esq.
Matthew Gissendanner, Esq.
Rebecca J. Dulin, Esq.
Heather Shirley Smith, Esq.
Mitchell Willoughby, Esq.
Benjamin P. Mustian, Esq.
John M. Bowen, Esq.
Margaret M. Fox, Esq.
Charles L.A. Terreni, Esq.
John J. Pringle, Jr., Esq.

PSC Staff Present:

Jocelyn Boyd, Chief Clerk/Executive Director
Joseph Melchers, General Counsel
Afton Ellison
Patricia Stephens
Jerisha Dukes, Esq.
Rob Bockman
Randy Erskine
Melissa Purvis

INDEX

Proceedings:

3

(*Transcriptionist's Notes: (1) A speaker labeled "Undetermined" means it could not be determined from the video who was speaking at that point in time; (2) the use of (inaudible) identifies speech that could be seen on video or faintly heard through the audio feed, but not reliably enough to transcribe due to speakers being off microphone.)

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 (Requested meeting excerpt begins at
3 video timestamp 17:59.)

4 MS. BOYD: Okay. If we could move on, everybody, to --
5 I don't know how -- I've thought about how to
6 organize this and how we should talk about these
7 procedural issues, and the only way I know to do
8 this is to start with 58-41 -- I think it's 30 --
9 or 20 or 30 and see if there are any procedural
10 issues you want us to talk about and to note,
11 unless somebody else has a better way of going
12 about our discussions.

13 MR. BURGESS: Jocelyn, prior to the (inaudible).

14 MS. BOYD: I'll get another lavalier, okay?

15 MR. BURGESS: Okay. I watched the Commission's meetings
16 the last couple of weeks, and I have compassion for
17 y'all here trying to pull apart this statute. But
18 in advance of today's meeting, I thought it might
19 be helpful to put some things down on paper. So
20 I've got a document I wanted to pass out to the
21 group here --

22 MS. BOYD: Okay.

23 MR. BURGESS: -- that I thought maybe we could -- we
24 could work from --

25 MS. BOYD: Okay.

1 MR. BURGESS: -- or at least for discussion purposes.

2 MS. BOYD: All right.

3 MR. BURGESS: And this is nothing that -- that we are
4 hard advocating for, but it's -- it's something
5 that I think the utilities and the other parties
6 have got a -- a fair amount of work to do.

7 MS. BOYD: Do you want us to use the ELMO at all?

8 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. Sure.

9 MS. BOYD: Okay.

10 MR. BURGESS: Yes.

11 MS. BOYD: Can you make me a copy, Chad?

12 MR. BURGESS: I -- I brought 50 copies.

13 MS. BOYD: Okay.

14 MR. BURGESS: So I think that should be enough for
15 everybody in the room, if -- there's some other
16 ones.

17 MR. ERSKINE: It just zooms in.

18 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. And, Jocelyn, I don't -- I don't --
19 I'm not trying to hijack your meeting, so --

20 MS. BOYD: You're not.

21 MR. BURGESS: -- you tell me to sit down if you want to.

22 MS. BOYD: I think -- I think -- I think we've noted
23 I'll have plenty of time talking at judicial

24 meetings about the bill, so --

25 MR. BURGESS: Okay. No.

1 MS. BOYD: -- I'm not trying to --

2 MR. BURGESS: Fair enough.

3 MS. BOYD: Please, everybody, feel free to say what
4 you --

5 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. Absolutely. Yeah. So -- so, to
6 your point, maybe you know the code sections better
7 than I do, but just starting from left and working
8 our way to the right, the -- I'll call -- I call it
9 the "standard offer docket."

10 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

11 MR. BURGESS: That's the one that probably needs --
12 well, it's -- we know that the Commission has a
13 hard deadline that is incorporated into the statute
14 by which they have to -- to make a -- a decision.
15 I don't know that they -- given the way the statute
16 reads, I don't know that they have to actually do
17 their final order by that date, but they certainly
18 need to at least approve the standard offers and
19 the avoided costs that are going to be presented by
20 the parties in that docket.

21 But all I did here, really, was -- and that
22 docket number -- these docket numbers just
23 reference Dominion Energy's docket numbers.

24 MS. BOYD: Okay.

25 MR. BURGESS: So Duke has different ones. And I know

1 there may be some parties who want to discuss
2 consolidation issues and whatnot, but this was just
3 focusing on -- on my client, Dominion Energy, with
4 -- with the dockets they've got, that they're
5 looking into the headlights with for now. But,
6 obviously, the Commission's already opened up the
7 docket --

8 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

9 MR. BURGESS: -- as they're required to do so. We think
10 they've got to get their vote done by November
11 13th. So from there, we just plugged in some
12 proxies with respect to potential filing dates,
13 because I presume the next thing the Commission's
14 going to do with respect to this docket is issue a
15 "Notice of -- Notice of Filing and Hearing,"
16 obviously, getting this set up.

17 MR. ERSKINE: (Inaudible.)

18 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

19 MS. BOYD: Is it on?

20 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. It's on.

21 MR. BURGESS: It's on.

22 MS. BOYD: (Inaudible.)

23 MR. BURGESS: You know, I've watched Scott do this over
24 the years like a master, and -- and here I am
25 fumbling around, so . . .

1 MS. BOYD: Excuse me.

2 MR. BURGESS: So, in any event, these are just some
3 proxy dates that we've -- that we've plugged in for
4 -- as far as testimony goes. And there's no --
5 there's no magic, if you will, with respect to this
6 -- these testimony deadlines, but it's just
7 something to -- to use as discussion purposes. We
8 looked at it from a -- from a -- I call it a
9 "4-2-1," where, after the utility filed their
10 testimony, then four weeks would be when
11 intervenors and ORS would file their testimony, and
12 then there'd be two weeks for rebuttal and a week
13 for surrebuttal. Again, that's up for the
14 Commission to decide on what they want to do.

15 MS. BOYD: All right.

16 MR. BURGESS: But that was just a thought with respect
17 to that docket.

18 Of all the dockets, you know, from a
19 procedural standpoint, you know, that one, I think,
20 again, is -- is hard-wired into the statute, and we
21 know what the Commission's got to do and under the
22 timeline in which they've got to get it done.

23 So those are my thoughts for -- from a
24 Dominion Energy perspective. I don't know if -- if
25 others have thoughts. And, again, I'll let you

1 moderate this -- that -- Jocelyn, so you --

2 MS. BOYD: So -- okay. Yeah. No problem.

3 MR. BURGESS: You tell me what you want to do.

4 MS. BOYD: So does anyone else have a comment? I call
5 it "the avoided cost docket."

6 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

7 MS. BOYD: So -- oh, Hamilton. Oh, I have --

8 MR. DAVIS: (Inaudible.)

9 MS. BOYD: I have a microphone for you.

10 MR. DAVIS: I warmed up.

11 MS. BOYD: Oh, okay.

12 MR. DAVIS: (Inaudible) back of everyone.

13 So, Chad, y'all -- this is -- this is actually
14 a relief, in part. Y'all are viewing the -- that
15 November deadline as being the actual vote for the
16 Commission, not the order from the Commission.

17 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. And I'll say that's just Chad
18 interpreting the statute. So the Commission
19 certainly may think differently than that. But the
20 reason I came up with that was: I think there are
21 other, actually, parts in the statute where they
22 actually talk about a written order being issued by
23 a date. They didn't say that for the avoided
24 costs.

25 MR. DAVIS: No. I was looking back at the language just

1 now, and I think that's --

2 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. And I think that would --

3 MR. DAVIS: -- that's possible.

4 MR. BURGESS: That actually gives the Commission a

5 little bit more time in which to evaluate the

6 docket, because, if they had to get a written order

7 out by November 13th, then that takes a little bit

8 longer to do. So that -- that was my thought

9 process.

10 MR. DAVIS: Dawn, do y'all have -- do you have any

11 thoughts on that?

12 MS. HIPPIE: Well, actually I -- one is that (inaudible)

13 deciding on (inaudible) --

14 MR. DAVIS: Yeah.

15 MS. HIPPIE: We've got a bunch of different (inaudible).

16 MR. DAVIS: I think we -- I think we've counted to

17 November 18th, and I think that's ORS's -- what

18 they've honed in on as well.

19 MS. HIPPIE: Yeah. That would be helpful, and then I -- I

20 (inaudible) not necessarily the order has to be --

21 MR. DAVIS: Yeah.

22 MS. HIPPIE: -- be issued.

23 MR. BURGESS: And November 13th/November 18th, I -- I --

24 MS. HIPPIE: Either is fine.

25 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. It's --

1 MS. HIPPE: I just think we -- you know, it would be
2 helpful if you could just (inaudible).

3 MR. BURGESS: Oh. I'm sorry. And Matt -- because Matt
4 was assisting. November 13th, actually, is on a
5 Wednesday, so I was just presuming that the
6 Commission would actually meet on Wednesday. I
7 think November 16th might be a Saturday or
8 something like that, so . . .

9 MR. DAVIS: Yeah.

10 UNDETERMINED: The 18th's (inaudible).

11 MR. DAVIS: The 18th's a Monday.

12 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. So I don't -- they're not going to
13 meet on a Monday. They'd probably meet on that
14 Wednesday prior. That's all. But there's --

15 MS. GRUNDMANN: So yours is a practical date of when the
16 Commission is actually scheduled to sit down and
17 meet prior to --

18 MR. BURGESS: Well, their -- yeah. They're not -- I
19 don't. Yeah. They're -- they normally --

20 MS. GRUNDMANN: Right.

21 MR. BURGESS: -- meet on Wednesdays at two o'clock.

22 MS. GRUNDMANN: So, technically, they could call a
23 special meeting --

24 MR. BURGESS: They --

25 MS. GRUNDMANN: -- on, say, the 18th.

1 MR. BURGESS: Yes.

2 MS. GRUNDMANN: But we're going to assume that the
3 Commission doesn't want to do that, so your date is
4 the real date that y'all think --

5 MR. BURGESS: That's -- that's correct. If -- if --
6 you're absolutely right about that.

7 MS. GRUNDMANN: So everybody -- I agree --

8 MR. BURGESS: That's -- that's correct.

9 MS. HIPPE: We'll go with whatever date, just so they
10 pick one.

11 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. Yeah.

12 MR. MELCHERS: Well, I think they (inaudible) the
13 18th --

14 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. They certainly could.

15 MR. MELCHERS: (Inaudible.)

16 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. I would agree to that. Yeah. So
17 if they wanted five more days, no -- no problem.

18 Yeah. That's right.

19 MR. DAVIS: So --

20 MR. BURGESS: But I don't know that they're going -- I
21 -- I don't think they've done their calendar out
22 that far, so that may be NARUC, to what Randy was
23 pointing out earlier with the DMS. I don't know.

24 MR. MELCHERS: (Inaudible.)

25 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

1 MR. MELCHERS: They may want to wait and do something on
2 the 18th.

3 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

4 MR. MELCHERS: (Inaudible.)

5 MR. BURGESS: The December 4th is just -- I presume the
6 Commission's going to ask for proposed orders, and
7 we were just looking at past -- past dockets as far
8 as getting an order out with respect to the docket.
9 There's no -- there's no magic in that date either.
10 It's just kind of -- just from the years of
11 practice appearing before the Commission as to how
12 things kind of get pushed out.

13 So -- but, again, going back to -- again, the
14 interpretation, I don't think -- there's no -- at
15 least from my -- my opinion is there's no
16 requirement that it comes out by December 4th. It
17 could -- it could be later if the Commission wanted
18 that to.

19 MR. MELCHERS: Chad, (inaudible) order.

20 MR. BURGESS: Sure. Yeah. That's -- that's right.

21 MR. MELCHERS: And then the Commission (inaudible) have
22 their order (

23 MR. BURGESS: That -- that's correct. I will say,
24 Joseph, avoided costs, they drive certain other
25 things. So the sooner the Commission could get an

1 order out, at least from my perspective, I think
2 that would help the companies be able to formulate
3 what they need to do down the road. And also it
4 would help Hamilton and his -- his folks as far as
5 knowing what an avoided cost is so they can do the
6 calculations with respect to their project.

7 MS. SMITH: I -- I had a question (inaudible) so when
8 we're talking about proposed orders (inaudible)
9 proposed orders (inaudible)?

10 MR. BURGESS: Well, you -- you could, yes. That's
11 correct. Yeah.

12 MS. SMITH: Thank you.

13 MR. BURGESS: We've got a lot of bright minds in here,
14 so we can -- we are going to be able to sort this
15 out.

16 MR. DAVIS: So I -- I think the date -- I mean, the end
17 dates look good, and I like the -- the flexibility
18 of thinking about this as a vote prior to the 18th.
19 I think, as you guys heard on Wednesday, we've got
20 a little bit of a different perspective as far as
21 the opportunity to consolidate and maybe the
22 ordering of this proceeding where we see the need
23 for the Commission to establish the methodology
24 prior to the companies coming in and filing rates
25 that are in compliance with those methodologies or

1 the methodology.

2 And, you know, our -- our preference would be
3 to have a consolidated docket for the purpose of
4 evaluating which methodologies are available to use
5 and then having Commission decision on whether
6 we're using more than one in the state and what
7 exactly is -- is required within the context of
8 applying that methodology. Then having the
9 utilities file their rates based on the methodology
10 that's been adopted and -- and have a -- an order
11 out of that.

12 I mean, I think we're all -- we also read the
13 statute to -- to not require those rates be set
14 within that time period, that the methodology needs
15 to be adopted, the rates don't. We want to see
16 those rates set sooner rather than later, though.
17 So that's really more of a practical question of:
18 Can we get a schedule in place that accommodates a
19 proper kind of hearing and -- and determination
20 around methodology and then also a -- a compliance
21 review on the back side of that?

22 And, again, we -- as you mentioned, we're --
23 we're in limbo right now. We, basically, are --
24 the -- the pause button has been hit on the
25 utility-scale industry until we get through this

1 docket for all intents and purposes. And --

2 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. I -- I don't think this -- y'all
3 certainly could advance that argument, Hamilton, if
4 you wanted to consolidate dockets. I think the way
5 the Commission's already kind of set it up, they've
6 kind of bucketed the utilities in their own dockets
7 because . . .

8 MR. DAVIS: So we -- we've got a -- we've got a general
9 docket that was opened, and then we have utility-
10 specific dockets, and I think for purposes of rate
11 -- the actual rate, it -- it certainly makes sense
12 to have those in -- now and in the future in a -- a
13 single utility-specific docket. But the -- the
14 proceeding methodology conversation and -- and
15 decisions that come out of that, we think should be
16 a --

17 MR. BURGESS: And I think one thing y'all agree on --

18 MR. DAVIS: We -- we don't see a -- we -- we see it as
19 being unproductive to have the same conversation
20 with -- with Duke as we're having with SCE&G in two
21 different dockets with --

22 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. I certainly appreciate the -- y'all
23 having to run between the utilities with respect to
24 -- and discussing the same topic.

25 MR. DAVIS: Right.

1 MR. BURGESS: You did make one comment about you didn't
2 think avoided costs were in here. I think -- I
3 think -- I think "standard offer" is actually
4 defined in the statute, and it includes avoided
5 costs in that definition.

6 MR. DAVIS: It does have an avoided cost -- there would
7 need to be an -- a standard offer rate set --

8 MR. BURGESS: Right. Yes.

9 MR. DAVIS: -- as part of that.

10 MR. BURGESS: So yeah.

11 MR. DAVIS: And so that -- that would be -- the
12 Commission would need to -- to answer whether that
13 is what's currently been approved or the
14 methodology that's currently been approved, could
15 that be used to set those rates or -- or not.

16 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. So -- yeah. I think all those are
17 things, Jocelyn, that, obviously, different parties
18 have different perspectives, and the Commission
19 will have to make a decision depending upon what
20 folks bring up. But it -- but I think, from the
21 Commission's perspective, you -- you -- you've got
22 to initiate it by way of a notice of filing in a
23 hearing and then let everybody kind of go to their
24 respective corners and figure out what they want to
25 argue.

1 MS. BOYD: Right. And -- and I think you're referring
2 to Docket Number 2019 (inaudible) establishing
3 methodologies before (inaudible).

4 MR. DAVIS: I think that's -- that's right. Yes, ma'am.
5 Let me make sure before I say yes. That's the --
6 that's the generic docket that was opened.

7 MS. BOYD: Yes. That's --

8 MR. DAVIS: Yeah. Yes, ma'am.

9 MS. BOYD: Okay. So then --

10 MR. BURGESS: And our thought, Jocelyn, was that all
11 that would be dealt with in the utility-specific
12 docket.

13 MS. BOYD: Okay.

14 MS. DULIN: Jocelyn, for what it's worth, that's
15 (inaudible) as well.

16 MS. BOYD: Okay.

17 MS. DULIN: That the utility-specific docket can handle
18 everything that's -- that's been enumerated in 58-
19 41-20, which includes the avoided cost rate as it's
20 defined. And we would offer that all of that can
21 be considered in the utility-specific docket. I
22 think we could consider whether it would be
23 judicious to combine those -- consider that down
24 the road, but we certainly think that those should
25 be individual things considering all of these

1 different items that are set forth (inaudible).

2 MR. DAVIS: So I think that -- yeah. I mean, I -- I
3 suspected that we'd probably have a difference of
4 opinion coming into this on that issue, and -- and
5 I do see that as an important kind of threshold
6 decision that the -- the Commission is going to
7 need to make --

8 MS. BOYD: Okay.

9 MR. DAVIS: -- fairly quickly. And I know we'll be
10 following up after this meeting with -- with --
11 with filings that -- that speak to that.

12 MS. BOYD: Okay. Wonderful. May I -- may I just ask
13 this question as it relates to that? Because I
14 imagine the commissioners will want to continue
15 moving forward discussion -- discussing how to
16 proceed, either with Hamilton's position, with
17 generic docket and then the independent dockets, or
18 Chad and -- and Rebecca's. If they want you to
19 articulate further your rationale -- Hamilton, I
20 know y'all had a briefing -- are you-all opposed to
21 just very short oral arguments? Because I need to
22 ask that question. If they want to hear from
23 you --

24 MR. DAVIS: We'd be comfortable doing that.

25 MS. BOYD: Okay. Because I think, maybe, they might

1 want to hear just a little more. I don't know that
2 it would take a lot of --

3 MR. DAVIS: I think having that conversation, rather
4 than just doing it in writing, makes sense.

5 MS. DULIN: I think that (inaudible) something written
6 and then --

7 MS. BOYD: Okay. If they want it?

8 MS. DULIN AND MS. SMITH: (Nods head up and down.)

9 MS. DULIN: But --

10 MS. BOYD: Okay. Yeah. I just -- I don't know, but I
11 -- I thought I would ask just in case the question
12 arises. Okay. Wonderful.

13 MS. GRUNDMANN: My name is Carrie Grundmann. I'm here
14 today on behalf of Walmart.

15 MS. BOYD: Okay.

16 MS. GRUNDMANN: Is there -- I think comments
17 (inaudible) --

18 MS. BOYD: Okay. The comments --

19 MS. GRUNDMANN: -- so (inaudible)?

20 MR. DAVIS: The IRP.

21 MS. GRUNDMANN: Okay. And the reason I'm here today is
22 you've given me this spreadsheet, and I envision
23 that I could receive two more spreadsheets. And
24 that's what my client was a little overwhelmed on.
25 So I just really am here to listen and understand,

1 and I don't know whether I have a preference for
2 your proposal or yours, but I'm just trying to
3 understand when is the best time to provide that to
4 you guys.

5 MS. BOYD: Yeah.

6 MS. GRUNDMANN: (Inaudible) oral arguments. Do you want
7 both written comments and oral arguments?

8 MS. BOYD: Well, I'll -- I only mention the oral
9 arguments just in case. Sometimes commissioners, I
10 think, want to know more than what you might be
11 able to narrate, yes.

12 MS. GRUNDMANN: Okay.

13 MS. BOYD: And we don't have any comments due just yet,
14 other than the IRP.

15 MS. GRUNDMANN: (Inaudible.)

16 MS. BOYD: On Wednesday, actually.

17 MS. GRUNDMANN: Okay.

18 MS. BOYD: Because they -- they ended up giving a week.

19 I just -- that's -- that's just me. Some
20 commissioners, like Judge Ervin, he might not want
21 -- recommend oral arguments. He might want -- he
22 might be able to make his decision based on your
23 filings. Others might feel as though that they --
24 they might want you to flesh out a little bit more
25 what you're trying to say -- what you're trying to

1 articulate. But what I would like to be able to do
2 is give them -- tell them, "Look, Hamilton said
3 this. Chad and Rebecca said this. Others are
4 going to file their comments later."

5 MR. GOLDIN: Jocelyn, for what it's worth --

6 MS. BOYD: Oh, hey, Jamey.

7 MR. GOLDIN: Hey. How you doing? Johnson
8 Development --

9 MS. BOYD: Yes.

10 MR. GOLDIN: -- filed intervenor in all four dockets
11 now, and support Hamilton's position --

12 MS. BOYD: Okay.

13 MR. GOLDIN: -- and would like to (inaudible)
14 consolidation, prefer it where necessary -- where
15 possible. Certainly, we see value in having a
16 break in steps (inaudible).

17 MS. BOYD: Okay.

18 MR. GOLDIN: But we can certainly consolidate -- or hope
19 to consolidate for purposes of methodology for
20 South Carolina.

21 MS. BOYD: All right. Does anybody else have any
22 comments?

23 UNDETERMINED: (Inaudible) whether they're the same
24 methodology in South Carolina (inaudible).

25 MR. HOLMAN: Oh, absolutely.

1 UNDETERMINED: (Inaudible.)

2 MS. BOYD: I -- I think that you -- if you would -- I'm
3 still going to -- I will let them know about this,
4 but if you want to provide written comments, you
5 may feel free to do so because I know Ms. Belser
6 asked us to conduct this session. And so we'll
7 report to all of them what -- what we've listened
8 to, what you've said -- what you say today, and
9 then -- but I don't think it will hurt if you want
10 -- if you're prepared to go ahead and file your
11 written comments. I think that will be fine.

12 Okay. Does anyone else have any comments on
13 -- then -- on the avoided -- oh, hey, Bland.

14 MR. HOLMAN: Just a -- (inaudible).

15 MS. BOYD: And -- and -- oh, the hearing that we -- that
16 you've listed here, I know you said that's just for
17 SCE&G's docket. Let me ask this: Is anyone
18 opposed to consolidating those hearings? Maybe
19 you've already said that. I think you have said --
20 I think you've spoken, Rebecca and Chad. You don't
21 -- you would prefer that the hearings for the --

22 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. I --

23 MS. BOYD: -- for the -- for the setting the rates not
24 be combined?

25 MR. BURGESS: That -- that -- that's correct.

1 MS. BOYD: Okay. What do -- Hamilton, do you prefer
2 that, too?

3 MR. DAVIS: Ask that again.

4 MS. BOYD: For the -- for the actual hearing on the
5 rates, not the methodology --

6 MR. DAVIS: Yeah. I think that having those be utility-
7 specific makes sense.

8 MS. BOYD: Okay. Okay. I know they opened the --

9 MR. DAVIS: I mean, I would envision the rate-setting
10 looking something like what we've done in the -- I
11 mean, outside of the fuel docket, but -- but
12 similar to what the status quo has been in terms of
13 having the utilities file on a different -- I mean,
14 this cycle may be different, given the -- the
15 timeline -- or the -- the -- if we -- if we
16 determine that setting the rates prior to this
17 November 18th date, they'll have to run in
18 parallel, as I think Chad and Rebecca are
19 proposing, anyway. Moving forward, I don't know
20 that the Commission's going to want to have to deal
21 with multiple avoided cost dockets overlapping each
22 other in, you know, 2021.

23 MR. GOLDIN: And, Jocelyn, I do think (inaudible)
24 statute they have to set the rate by that time.

25 MS. BOYD: Okay.

1 MR. GOLDIN: (Inaudible) that's for the Commission to
2 decide. That's just my opinion.

3 MS. BOYD: May I ask one other thing? Are -- are you --
4 because I'm looking at -- we're trying to schedule
5 the hearing for 460-D right now, interconnection
6 timeline. I just wanted to ask --

7 MR. BURGESS: So -- yes.

8 MS. BOYD: So are you-all opposed, though, to us -- the
9 Commission scheduling those hearings on a
10 Wednesday, Thursday, Friday --

11 MR. BURGESS: So --

12 MS. BOYD: -- in succession?

13 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. So, Jocelyn, maybe, if you --
14 before we jump to interconnection, I don't know if
15 there's anything --

16 MS. BOYD: Oh --

17 MR. BURGESS: -- else you wanted to --

18 MS. BOYD: Well, no. I didn't want to jump to
19 interconnection just yet. I just wanted to know,
20 for example, for these cases, let's say the avoided
21 cost rates, are you opposed to setting different
22 days, but they're just in succession? They're not
23 a week apart.

24 MR. BURGESS: Oh, I -- you know, from Dominion's
25 perspective, I think we're indifferent on that.

1 So --

2 MS. BOYD: Okay.

3 MR. BURGESS: -- if the Commission wants to have
4 Dominion come in a Tuesday and Duke come in on
5 Wednesday, I mean, that's fine with me. Or if they
6 want to separate it a week -- I don't know what the
7 workload is.

8 MS. BOYD: Okay. Well, the only reason why I asked,
9 someone else who's normally an intervenor in our
10 electric docket -- electric rate-case dockets
11 mentioned that oftentimes the same witnesses are
12 used -- or experts are used.

13 MR. BURGESS: Sure.

14 MS. BOYD: So that's the reason why I wanted to pose
15 that question: Is it better if your -- if your
16 expert has a flight -- if you're a typical
17 intervenor and they have a flight and they're going
18 to, you know, appear in a Duke case and another
19 Duke case, would you rather the hearings all be --

20 MR. BURGESS: Sure.

21 MS. BOYD: -- scheduled in close proximity versus having
22 to fly them out, fly them back. That's why I
23 wanted to ask that question.

24 MS. HIPPE: Yes.

25 MS. BOYD: Okay.

1 MR. NELSON: (Inaudible.)

2 MS. BOYD: Okay.

3 MS. DULIN: I do think that there's a strong possibility
4 that (inaudible) longer than a one-day hearing.

5 MS. BOYD: Okay.

6 MS. DULIN: We -- we do this regularly in North
7 Carolina, and I hope it's not like this, but it's a
8 week long for the Duke case.

9 MS. BOYD: Right.

10 MS. DULIN: I hope it's not like that here, but just --
11 you know, to (inaudible) scheduling this, it may be
12 longer than one day. So --

13 MS. BOYD: Yeah.

14 MS. DULIN: But I don't know how we kind of coordinate
15 all that. Certainly we have one expert for both
16 Duke utilities and we'd like to take advantage of
17 efficiencies there and -- and ORS experts, however
18 we'd go about that.

19 MS. BOYD: Okay.

20 MS. DULIN: But (inaudible).

21 MS. BOYD: Yeah. And we'll -- and -- and I agree. I
22 just -- I want us to think about it, too, because I
23 think we want to have everybody save costs. So
24 we'll have to think of -- I -- I don't think we've
25 had to give it that much thought in the past, but

1 we might have to give it a little bit more thought.

2 MS. DULIN: Sure.

3 MS. BOYD: Especially if they know all these cases are
4 coming. So I didn't want to jump to that; I just
5 know I'm trying to schedule that now, and I was
6 trying to think of --

7 MR. BURGESS: No. That makes sense.

8 MS. BOYD: -- how to schedule that hearing.

9 MS. DULIN: Okay.

10 MR. BURGESS: Maybe I can -- well -- well, I think when
11 we get to interconnection --

12 MS. BOYD: Yes.

13 MR. BURGESS: -- we might be able to help you.

14 MS. BOYD: Okay.

15 MS. GRUNDMANN: Well, before we get to interconnection,
16 just in terms of scheduling (inaudible) I felt like
17 for both Duke cases, we were operating on a lot of
18 hope that we were going to complete that case on a
19 Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and it became pretty
20 clear by like midmorning on Thursday that that
21 wasn't going to happen, and there was scrambling by
22 all parties to be like, "My expert can't come back
23 on Monday." Or "My expert can only be" -- and
24 those created the scheduling issues. If -- if you
25 were going to schedule -- so, for example, I use

1 different witnesses for different rate cases, and
2 had it been something where we were just going to
3 offer testimony, I could have offered one witness
4 as opposed to two (inaudible) offset scheduling
5 issues obligated me to have two for Walmart.

6 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

7 MS. GRUNDMANN: But for me one of the biggest issues
8 that creates some of the confusion (inaudible) we
9 can't really predict if we're going to straddle a
10 weekend or not.

11 MS. BOYD: Yeah.

12 MS. GRUNDMANN: So I don't know if that's an avoidable
13 issue, but --

14 MS. BOYD: Well, we've never -- I just think that's an
15 issue the Commission is going -- we're going to
16 have to spend more time on.

17 MS. GRUNDMANN: Right.

18 MS. BOYD: I mean --

19 MS. GRUNDMANN: Starting on Monday -- when there's a
20 risk, even if goes to a fourth day --

21 MS. BOYD: Yeah.

22 MS. GRUNDMANN: -- it -- more than a Wednesday,
23 Thursday, Friday --

24 MS. BOYD: Right.

25 MS. GRUNDMANN: -- you know you're going to have to come

1 back on Monday, whereas if you started on --

2 MS. BOYD: -- a Monday, yeah.

3 MS. GRUNDMANN: -- a Monday --

4 MS. DULIN: Yeah.

5 MS. GRUNDMANN: Yeah.

6 MS. BOYD: I think those -- these are all issues we need
7 to talk about.

8 MS. GRUNDMANN: Okay.

9 MS. BOYD: We -- we -- we really haven't, I don't think,
10 talked about it before. I think we need to talk
11 about it.

12 MR. BURGESS: And, Jocelyn, I'll just add one last thing
13 on the standard offer; in -- in 58-41-20, it does
14 talk about the Commission establishing each
15 electric utility standard offer. So, you know, as
16 -- as the Commission debates whether to break this
17 docket out into another side docket, if you will --

18 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

19 MR. BURGESS: -- or consolidate Duke and -- and Dominion
20 together, you know, I think the language is -- is
21 pretty clear there that -- that the -- that the
22 Commission is -- is opening a docket for each
23 utility.

24 MS. BOYD: What section is that again, Chad?

25 MR. BURGESS: 58-41-20(A).

1 MS. BOYD: A, okay. Yes. All right. Thank you. Is
2 that it on avoided?

3 MR. BURGESS: That's all I have on avoided cost docket,
4 unless my colleagues here have anything else they
5 want to say.

6 MS. BOYD: Does anyone else have any -- any other
7 comments on avoided cost docket?

8 MS. DULIN: One thing --

9 MS. BOYD: Yes.

10 MS. DULIN: -- I'll -- we haven't talked about -- we've
11 talked a lot about avoided cost but there's also
12 requirements related to certain (inaudible) --

13 MS. BOYD: Yes.

14 MS. DULIN: -- and also --

15 MS. BOYD: Yes.

16 MS. DULIN: -- (inaudible) probably all would agree
17 (inaudible) docket or -- or issue. So just think
18 through -- yeah. I -- the Duke position is that
19 all of those issues -- as I said earlier, all of
20 those issues would be (inaudible) in the docket
21 that's open now and utility specific. But I don't
22 know if you guys have other thoughts.

23 MR. DAVIS: I -- I mean, I -- I agree that they all --
24 all those issues are set to be determined under
25 this November 18th time frame.

1 MS. BOYD: Okay.

2 MR. DAVIS: Whether they're in this docket or not, I
3 think it probably makes sense to include them in
4 the docket. I -- and I think we have the same
5 perspective that, to a -- to a point, these issues
6 mirror each other between the utilities, and
7 consolidation provides efficiency in that respect.
8 Once you get to a certain point, then there become
9 utility-specific issues that -- that could be dealt
10 with in the respective utility dockets. So, I
11 mean, we'll -- again, we'll be articulating that to
12 the Commission.

13 MR. GOLDIN: And, Jocelyn, if you look at -- in there it
14 talks about (inaudible) --

15 MS. BOYD: Yes. Yes.

16 MR. GOLDIN: -- (inaudible) in there.

17 MS. BOYD: Yes.

18 MR. GOLDIN: -- look that is probably going to be
19 utility specific --

20 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

21 MR. GOLDIN: -- for the intervenors (inaudible) --

22 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

23 MR. GOLDIN: -- whatever it is.

24 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

25 MR. GOLDIN: (Inaudible) by a certain time frame --

1 MS. BOYD: Right.

2 MR. GOLDIN: -- have this, you know -- to have it in

3 writing (inaudible) Commission. You know, I -- I

4 would envision it being like (inaudible).

5 MR. GISSENDANNER: (Inaudible.)

6 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

7 MR. GISSENDANNER: (Inaudible.)

8 MS. BOYD: Okay.

9 MR. DAVIS: Yeah. I --

10 MR. GISSENDANNER: Outside of the statute.

11 MR. DAVIS: Yeah. Well, I -- I'd agree, Matt. Our --

12 our -- our position is not that the statute

13 requires it. It's that the -- the Commission has

14 the flexibility to make these decisions in -- in

15 whether consolidation makes sense due to natural

16 overlap of the conversations we're having is --

17 MR. GOLDIN: And I feel --

18 MR. DAVIS: -- what is left to them to decide.

19 MR. GOLDIN: -- it's a contested issue. They're one --

20 do they decide on one or do they decide on

21 multiple, but that is within their -- on my reading

22 of the statute, that's for them to decide.

23 MS. BOYD: Yeah.

24 MR. GOLDIN: We're just going to have different

25 positions, possibly, on that. I think ORS may have

1 a take on it, as well.

2 MS. BOYD: Yeah. I just -- I -- in listening to you, I
3 -- I -- of course, I -- I don't sit as a
4 commissioner, but I think -- I think you putting
5 your positions in writing, but I also -- I could --
6 I think it would be a beautiful thing for them to
7 hear you-all because there could be some areas
8 where we just get creative.

9 Of course, there might be small areas where
10 they can be more efficient in the -- during the
11 hearing process. So that's all I'm looking for.
12 And I -- I just -- sometimes things are worked out
13 better when people -- when you hear it -- you can
14 read it, but when you hear people talking, you can
15 work through things better.

16 MR. GOLDIN: Jocelyn, what would be the venue in your
17 mind, then, to do that -- that?

18 MS. BOYD: Well, I said oral arguments. It doesn't have
19 to be like that, because "oral arguments" makes it
20 sound like, you know --

21 MR. GOLDIN: Right.

22 MS. BOYD: -- everybody's at odds.

23 MR. GOLDIN: Would a technical workshop --

24 MR. DAVIS: Yeah. That's one of the things we
25 recommended in the EPB on Wednesday, is -- and

1 whether that's the right terminology, whether --
2 whether it's a workshop or a technical conference,
3 it's some venue whereby the Commission can ask the
4 -- the various intervenors, participants questions
5 so that they -- they fully understand what the --
6 MS. BOYD: I don't know that -- like for -- if we use
7 our regulations, I don't know that a prehearing
8 conference -- we could call it that. Technical
9 conference, I -- I don't know that that wouldn't be
10 a bad idea. I think the commissioners can -- we
11 notice it and they can sit in on that.
12 MR. GOLDIN: Dawn, do you -- y'all have to have a
13 prehearing conference?
14 MS. HIPPE: Yes.
15 MR. NELSON: (Inaudible.)
16 MS. BOYD: Okay.
17 MR. NELSON: That's a good idea.
18 MR. GOLDIN: Yeah.
19 MR. NELSON: Some kind of prehearing conference or
20 whatever you want to call it.
21 MS. BOYD: Right.
22 UNDETERMINED: I like that.
23 MR. NELSON: So --
24 MS. SMITH: I -- I --
25 MR. NELSON: (Inaudible.)

1 MS. SMITH: I definitely think we need a prehearing
2 conference, but I think we're talking about the
3 interpretation of the statute. It's a legal issue.
4 And it really does legally go to our fundamental
5 belief that our take on the best way possible, with
6 the groups of intervenors that are affected by our
7 utility and whether, you know, each utility has an
8 individual methodology based on need is going to be
9 something that's going to be argued (inaudible)
10 docket. So to us, this isn't scheduled -- this
11 isn't just scheduling and calendaring; this is a
12 fundamental substantive legal interpretation about
13 what the statute means and how we are able to try
14 our case.

15 So I -- I agree that we need a prehearing
16 conference to get this stuff sorted out, but I do
17 think we need oral argument on the fundamental
18 requirements of the act and what it means to the
19 utility -- utility working on the case (inaudible).

20 MS. BOYD: Okay.

21 MR. NELSON: And I -- and I -- I don't disagree with
22 you. I -- I think (inaudible).

23 MS. SMITH: Yeah.

24 MR. NELSON: (Inaudible.)

25 MS. SMITH: Yeah.

1 MS. BOYD: All right.

2 MS. GRUNDMANN: What we need today is to come up with

3 some agreed-upon questions that are initially

4 answered by all interested parties that we see

5 sitting in this room, that we think are the

6 questions that the Commissioners need answered, and

7 then everybody try to answer those two or three or

8 four very specific questions to try to focus the

9 issue. Because when I think about -- because

10 there's going to be written comments and then

11 there's going to be a hearing set and it's end of

12 June/4th of July holiday, got (inaudible) going

13 out, when are you really going to get that done and

14 heed this statutory deadline? If -- let's just say

15 that your -- your position prevails, you are

16 contemplating potentially two dockets that give the

17 Commission -- if they actually set the rates, have

18 to be done between now and November. If you're

19 right, it's one docket, and that's probably

20 slightly more manageable. But, if we all were

21 going to agree to answer, you know, "Can a single

22 -- singular avoided cost methodology be a

23 requirement for all IRPs in South Carolina?"

24 everybody answer that to -- you get --

25 MS. SMITH: Yeah. I'm --

1 MS. GRUNDMANN: You know, I don't care either way.

2 MS. SMITH: -- just trying to say I don't think the

3 Commission can answer -- I mean, I get that

4 (inaudible) for efficiency, but I don't think the

5 Commission can answer that question without

6 (inaudible) in terms of whether one methodology is

7 appropriate for all of South Carolina. That's a --

8 MS. GRUNDMANN: But do you think (inaudible)?

9 MR HOLMAN: That's a legal question.

10 MS. SMITH: Huh?

11 MR. HOLMAN: A legal question whether or not (inaudible)

12 methodology, to some extent, right?

13 MS. SMITH: No. I said it's a legal question as -- I

14 think the -- the Commission needs to understand and

15 make a decision on what does the statute require.

16 And through that --

17 MR. HOLMAN: That's a personal requirement.

18 MS. SMITH: -- if the statute affords us -- if the

19 statute affords us the ability --

20 MR. HOLMAN: Yeah.

21 MS. SMITH: -- the ability to have an individual --

22 MR. HOLMAN: Right.

23 MS. SMITH: -- you know, to talk about the methodology

24 in each docket, then, you know, that's not

25 necessarily something we're going to agree to give

1 -- you know, give away. I think we could have an
2 expedited oral argument.

3 MR. HOLMAN: Jocelyn, what were the Commissioners
4 thinking when setting up the third docket after
5 they already --

6 MS. BOYD: That was -- actually, that was me --

7 MR. BURGESS: Actually --

8 MR. HOLMAN: (Inaudible.)

9 MS. BOYD: That was me. That was me. I -- I -- I
10 opened the -- the --

11 MR. HOLMAN: You've already answered the question.

12 MS. BOYD: And that -- that was me and I was trying to
13 -- because I -- that -- the statute said "as soon
14 as possible." And then -- and we opened that one
15 and I think the Community Solar.

16 And so then it crossed my mind, I was like,
17 "What better forum for all of us to talk at one
18 time other than the Commission business meeting?"
19 So that's when I asked the chairman, "Well, can we
20 make a presentation?" So that's where I started.

21 And, really and truly, as I said, I was led by
22 a comment that I heard from an intervenor about the
23 cost. "Jocelyn, you know, why are y'all -- these
24 different hearings, we're having to -- to pay
25 experts this, that, and the other. Why not think

1 more about how everybody can come together at one
2 time if there are similar issues?"

3 So that was my thinking.

4 MR. HOLMAN: Right. (Inaudible.)

5 MR. BURGESS: But, Jocelyn, I think that the Commission
6 had already --

7 MS. SMITH: Yeah.

8 MR. BURGESS: -- set up a docket for each utility,
9 right? They've already set that.

10 MS. BOYD: They -- yes. After I did that --

11 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. They already set it.

12 MS. BOYD: They -- they instructed me to set up --

13 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

14 MS. BOYD: Now, Ms. Belser said -- I will say this, too
15 -- she said, "We can make a determination -- we
16 commissioners can make a determination later on if
17 we want to consolidate for hearing purposes."

18 MR. BURGESS: She did. That's right.

19 MS. BOYD: So I don't think that they -- I know they --

20 MR. BURGESS: I mean, that's --

21 MS. BOYD: -- haven't decided that issue yet.

22 MR. BURGESS: That -- that's --

23 MR. GISSENDANNER: But right now we have individual
24 dockets.

25 MS. BOYD: That is right.

1 MR. BURGESS: That's correct. That's right.

2 MR. GISSENDANNER: We don't have a single docket for

3 it --

4 MS. BOYD: That's right. That's right.

5 MR. BURGESS: Right.

6 MR. GISSENDANNER: -- a single docket?

7 MR. BURGESS: So I --

8 MR. DAVIS: But there's both, right, Matt?

9 MR. GISSENDANNER: So there are no -- but that's not --

10 MS. GRUNDMANN: (Inaudible.)

11 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

12 MR. GISSENDANNER: But they instructed Jocelyn to

13 open --

14 MR. BURGESS: -- three.

15 MR. DAVIS: Have they -- have y'all closed the generic

16 docket?

17 MS. BOYD: Have not closed it.

18 MR. DAVIS: Okay. So there's a generic docket and

19 specific dockets.

20 MS. BOYD: There's -- yeah.

21 MR. GISSENDANNER: But they would --

22 MR. BURGESS: They've already --

23 MR. GISSENDANNER: But they would have to make a

24 decision to consolidate --

25 MR. BURGESS: Yes.

1 MR. GISSENDANNER: -- already existing individual

2 dockets --

3 MR. BURGESS: So --

4 MR. GISSENDANNER: -- which they instructed --

5 MR. BURGESS: Right.

6 MR. GISSENDANNER: -- individual dockets. They -- they

7 (inaudible).

8 MR. BURGESS: So, Jocelyn, I think to -- for folks who

9 wish to have the dockets consolidated, I -- I

10 think, obviously, they need to advance their cause

11 with respect to that to the Commission, let the

12 Commission decide if they want to consolidate them

13 or not, and -- and, quite frankly, maybe -- maybe

14 that's how you schedule "oral argument": you know,

15 somebody makes a request to consolidate the

16 documents, haul us all over here, we can explain

17 why we think it should be done, why we shouldn't

18 think it be done. And then, you know, maybe in a

19 week's time, the Commission can -- can decide on

20 what they want to do from a -- from a procedural

21 standpoint.

22 MS. BOYD: Right. Actually, Chad, I was going to -- I

23 was just going to go back to the chairman and ask

24 him if -- if he would consider oral -- them talking

25 about that next week -- just oral arguments --

1 scheduling oral arguments, actually.

2 I wasn't going to wait for y'all. I was just
3 going to ask the chair if he would -- would
4 consider us placing that item on the agenda for
5 them to talk about.

6 MR. BURGESS: Sure.

7 MS. BOYD: Scheduled --

8 MR. HOLMAN: Would we be able to submit something in
9 writing for that?

10 MS. BOYD: Oh, yeah. Anytime. Please, y'all, don't --
11 yeah. You don't -- yeah. Anytime you want to
12 submit something. I just didn't want to wait
13 because I -- I know this is a lot of work for
14 everybody. But the more -- I think the clearer
15 that you understand the commissioners' intent, the
16 better. The -- the sooner you know, the better.

17 MR. NELSON: The Commission doesn't really want
18 (inaudible) rates that --

19 MR. PRINGLE: Wait a minute.

20 MR. NELSON: (Inaudible.)

21 MS. BOYD: Okay.

22 MR. PRINGLE: Do I understand that y'all are going to
23 raise the issue?

24 MR. DAVIS: We're planning to make a filing to
25 Commission. Yeah.

1 MR. PRINGLE: All right.

2 MR. DAVIS: No. We're -- we're planning to make a
3 filing to Commission next week.

4 MS. BOYD: Oh, okay. All right.

5 MR. DAVIS: But, I mean, I think that's consistent,
6 Jocelyn, with what we've been talking about this
7 morning.

8 MR. HOLMAN: Are you going to do it as a general filing?

9 MR. MELCHERS: That's not a motion.

10 MS. BOYD: (To Mr. Melchers) Say something?

11 MR. HOLMAN: I'm sorry. I'm not -- I'm not trying to
12 (inaudible).

13 MR. GISSENDANNER: I think it's easier to come from a
14 motion --

15 MR. BURGESS: I -- I --

16 MR. GISSENDANNER: -- from a --

17 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. I think --

18 MS. BOYD: Okay.

19 MR. MELCHERS: (Inaudible.)

20 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

21 MR. SMITH: You -- you going to -- you going to make a
22 motion to consolidate it in general, or (inaudible)
23 or how do they -- that's -- I mean, that's --
24 that's an option?

25 MR. DAVIS: That's -- that's one of the -- the options

1 available.

2 MR. BURGESS: So -- yeah.

3 MR. SMITH: We generally prefer (inaudible).

4 MS. BOYD: Right.

5 MR. DAVIS: So that doesn't -- we -- DEC and DEP are
6 going to be -- will you be consolidating dockets?

7 MS. DULIN: Yes.

8 MR. DAVIS: Okay. I think the thinking's the same for
9 the intervenors and others. There's -- there's a
10 good reason that DEC and DEP does that.

11 MR. BURGESS: So you've got --

12 MS. SMITH: (Inaudible) and we were thinking that you
13 keep the individual dockets and consolidate
14 (inaudible).

15 MR. DAVIS: Right.

16 MS. SMITH: -- so that they can (inaudible).

17 MS. GRUNDMANN: But I don't think he's proposing to
18 consolidate 184, 185, and 186. I think it wants to
19 leave those dates for after the generic docket.

20 MR. DAVIS: I think there's -- there's a methodology
21 discussion and decision that the Commission has to
22 make in the law --

23 MS. GRUNDMANN: (Inaudible.)

24 MR. DAVIS: -- that proceeds the -- the rates and --

25 MR. GISSENDANNER: They opened the generic docket -- the

1 Commission (inaudible) --

2 MR. BURGESS: Correct.

3 MR. GISSENDANNER: -- (inaudible) generic docket

4 (inaudible) so they would have to make a motion to

5 consolidate the dockets on the generic docket

6 (inaudible).

7 MR. BURGESS: That's correct.

8 MR. GISSENDANNER: We don't have a --

9 MR. NELSON: (Inaudible.)

10 MR. BURGESS: Agreed. Yeah.

11 MR. GISSENDANNER: They gave a directive for those to

12 Jocelyn --

13 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

14 MR. GISSENDANNER: -- for the purpose of --

15 MR. HOLMAN: (Inaudible.)

16 MS. GRUNDMANN: Well, but in all reality -- but in all

17 reality -- but in all reality, 176 is open. So you

18 can make a motion, I guess, to determine

19 methodology for all the utilities in 176 as opposed

20 to a motion to consolidate --

21 MR. BURGESS: Well --

22 MS. GRUNDMANN: -- 184, 185, and 186. I don't think

23 you'd ever want to do that.

24 MR. GISSENDANNER: Well, it's the same thing.

25 MR. BURGESS: Right. Well, I think -- for starters, I

1 think Hamilton's client is going to have to
2 intervene to begin with. They don't have a right
3 to file a motion just yet, so there's some more
4 procedural hoops they're going to have to work
5 through at that -- in order to get that motion in
6 front of the Commission.

7 So -- but, I mean, as we sit here today, Matt
8 is right. There are three dockets. And that's
9 what the Commission instructed the clerk to do, and
10 she's done that. Jocelyn has the right to -- to
11 terminate the generic docket today if she wishes to
12 do that.

13 MR. GOLDIN: I don't think she does under the act.

14 MR. BURGESS: I think she actually does, yeah. She's
15 the clerk.

16 MR. GOLDIN: The legislature says (inaudible) docket
17 open. I -- I don't know (inaudible) close that
18 docket. But I think it's moot because I think we
19 will -- he will move (inaudible) most likely move
20 to consolidate those into that docket. So I don't
21 believe (inaudible).

22 MS. SMITH: And we think the statute requirement in
23 South Carolina (inaudible).

24 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

25 MR. GISSENDANNER: That's what it says. It says the

1 docket --

2 MR. GOLDIN: There was no -- there was no requirement
3 for that docket.

4 MR. BURGESS: No. Not for this. Not for this docket.

5 MR. PRINGLE: Well, it's not going to be me, but
6 somebody could be a -- be a --

7 MR. BURGESS: Jack, I'm -- I'm good with where things
8 stand right now. So --

9 MR. DAVIS: I -- I am too, Chad. I don't know that even
10 Jocelyn -- we're not going to -- I don't think
11 there's a lot of -- it makes a lot of sense for us
12 to debate these things --

13 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

14 MR. DAVIS: -- before we debate them. So I -- it seems
15 like we understand the different parties'
16 positions.

17 MR. PRINGLE: Especially if I'm not involved.

18 MS. BOYD: Yeah. I -- I opened -- actually just for
19 everybody --

20 MR. BURGESS: You know you like punishment, Jack.

21 MS. BOYD: I opened the -- the docket, as I mentioned to
22 you, based on that and based on the way I thought
23 the statute could be read. I'm not a commissioner,
24 as I said. So I opened that one, based on my
25 reading and it did say "as soon as possible," and

1 then it just dawned on me, "Well, this is -- this
2 is so big," I asked the chairman for us to start
3 talking about it at Commission business meeting.
4 So that's how this happened.

5 MR. GOLDIN: It was Jocelyn.

6 MS. BOYD: Okay. Oh, okay. So that's how that
7 happened. I haven't -- I haven't closed it. But,
8 yeah. Please do -- well, if it's okay with you,
9 then I'll just tell the chair to expect some
10 filings related to these dockets very soon. Is
11 that okay? And then they can take these issues up.

12 MR. BURGESS: Sure.

13 MS. BOYD: Okay. All right.

14 MS. GRUNDMANN: I have not intervened in a single
15 docket.

16 MR. BURGESS: Good.

17 MS. GRUNDMANN: So I don't know what I want to intervene
18 in, but it's like 30 dockets and my client has to
19 make a decision.

20 MR. BURGESS: You said your client's Walmart?

21 MS. GRUNDMANN: (Nods head up and down.)

22 MR. BURGESS: Okay.

23 MS. GRUNDMANN: So if I file these comments, are you
24 going to oppose because I haven't intervened?
25 Because if we want to be expeditious here -- we are

1 going to intervene in something; we're just trying
2 to figure out what that is.

3 MR. BURGESS: Right.

4 MS. GRUNDMANN: And if there's going to be a separate
5 methodology docket, we may opt to just intervene in
6 that. If there --

7 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

8 MS. GRUNDMANN: If it's decided to do separate dockets,
9 we may opt to intervene in those. So I guess I'm
10 -- I am --

11 MR. BURGESS: Well, you're -- you're -- I'll -- I'll say
12 this. You're -- you're welcome to call me. I can
13 talk to my client to see if they'd be willing to
14 consent to your petition to intervene to speed
15 things along so we can . . .

16 MR. GOLDIN: Yeah. See, I don't think (inaudible)
17 intervene (inaudible).

18 MR. WILLOUGHBY: (To Mr. Nelson) (Inaudible.)

19 MS. BOYD: (Laughs.)

20 MR. NELSON: They're assuming you're here for
21 (inaudible).

22 MR. WILLOUGHBY: (Inaudible.)

23 MS. BOYD: Oh, gosh.

24 MR. DAVIS: Well, Jocelyn, we're filing our
25 interventions today.

1 MS. BOYD: Okay. Okay. Wonderful.

2 MR. DAVIS: If that makes --

3 MS. BOYD: Yeah.

4 MR. DAVIS: -- folks more comfortable.

5 MS. BOYD: Okay.

6 MR. BURGESS: Definitely gets the ball rolling.

7 MS. BOYD: I see some good results here. Everybody is

8 in a good mood. You always get better results that

9 way.

10 MR. DAVIS: Just -- just one -- I mean, one last thing.

11 I -- I -- we're going to file something next week.

12 I don't think that should supersede you reporting

13 back to the Commission on this conversation.

14 MS. BOYD: Oh, definitely. Yes.

15 MR. DAVIS: Okay. All right.

16 MS. BOYD: Okay.

17 MR. BURGESS: Okay.

18 MS. BOYD: We're ready for the --

19 MR. BURGESS: All right. So community solar, that may

20 be a little easier. So our thinking there,

21 Jocelyn, was you've already opened a docket --

22 MS. BOYD: Yes. I did.

23 MR. BURGESS: It's utility-specific again so, you know,

24 we'll let people decide what they want to do from a

25 consolidation standpoint. But our thinking was --

1 is that you'd issue a notice of filing and then
2 there would be a return date with respect to that
3 notice of filing. And then, after folks have
4 chosen to intervene or not intervene, then roughly
5 a week later the utility would file its initial
6 report that it's required to file under the
7 statute. And then, to the extent -- well,
8 actually, the utility's going to need to file an
9 updated report by November the 24th.

10 The utility would file that report then, and
11 to the extent that the utility filed a -- because
12 it's discretionary under the statute. To the
13 extent that they -- that the utility filed a new
14 community solar program or something similar to
15 that, that would be done in that docket.

16 MS. BOYD: Okay. Yeah. Solicit information. They just
17 update -- and I know that Judge Ervin and
18 Commissioner Williams voted on me sending the
19 letter; I just haven't sent it yet.

20 MR. BURGESS: Okay.

21 MS. BOYD: I think it gives the -- you 45 days, if I'm
22 recalling correctly.

23 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. I --

24 MS. DULIN: That was 30 days.

25 MS. BOYD: That was a 30-day. Because you've got --

1 okay. So --

2 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

3 MS. DULIN: But (inaudible). Yeah. It was hard to keep
4 up.

5 MS. BOYD: Yes. Yes. Yes. So I just haven't issued
6 the letters yet on it.

7 MR. BURGESS: Okay. Sure.

8 MS. BOYD: Okay. So everybody's in agreement, though,
9 that a hearing is not necessarily required for this
10 one.

11 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. I -- I don't think you need a
12 hearing unless someone's going to propose something
13 -- a new program or something like that.

14 MS. BOYD: All right. Y'all? Rob? Bland? Y'all --

15 MR. DAVIS: That's fine.

16 MS. BOYD: All right. Okay.

17 MR. BURGESS: Okay.

18 MS. BOYD: Okay. Chad, we'll move on.

19 MR. BURGESS: All right. So the voluntary renewable
20 energy program docket. So this one actually -- the
21 statute states that the utility has a hundred -- I
22 think it was 180 days --

23 MR. DAVIS: Twenty.

24 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. I'm sorry -- 120?

25 MS. BOYD: Voluntary --

1 MS. HIPPE: 120.

2 MR. BURGESS: 120. Thank you, Dawn.

3 So the utility has 120 days within which to
4 file a voluntary renewable energy program with the
5 Commission. So by my count, that would be
6 September 13th, if that's what the utility -- in
7 fact, the utility's going to have to do that unless
8 -- I think there's a provision later in the statute
9 that says, if they've -- if a utility already has
10 that in place, they just need to report on that, I
11 believe.

12 MS. BOYD: Did y'all receive that letter? I sent a
13 letter out this week on that.

14 MR. BURGESS: I -- I have not seen a letter on the
15 voluntary renewable energy program docket, no.

16 MS. BOYD: Okay. I'll find it for you.

17 MR. BURGESS: Okay. But our reading of the statute,
18 Jocelyn, was that's -- that's utility driven, not
19 Commission driven. The utility has, under the
20 statute, 120 days by which to make that filing.

21 MS. BOYD: I thought this was the one dealing with --
22 okay. F. I apologize. Under -- remember, we
23 talked about that during the Commission meeting,
24 Subsection F, which says, if the utility has a
25 program in place --

1 MR. BURGESS: Yes. That's what I was speaking about
2 earlier. So if they do have one in place, they
3 would then follow -- they'd follow F and make the
4 appropriate filing to let the Commission know
5 they've already got one in place.

6 MS. BOYD: Did you receive that letter? Did y'all
7 receive that letter?

8 MR. BURGESS: I have not received that letter, no.

9 MS. BOYD: Oh, okay.

10 MS. SMITH AND MS. DULIN: (Shake heads from side to
11 side.)

12 MS. SMITH: (Inaudible.)

13 MS. BOYD: Okay. All right.

14 MR. BURGESS: And then our thinking was, once the --
15 once -- for example, when Dominion files its
16 voluntary renewable energy program by September
17 13th, then there would be testimony --

18 MS. BOYD: Okay.

19 MR. BURGESS: -- deadlines, and these are the -- these
20 -- these are the dates in which we were thinking
21 made most sense with respect to getting a voluntary
22 renewable energy program approved by the
23 Commission.

24 MS. BOYD: Okay.

25 MR. BURGESS: And, again, March 25th, Wednesday, not

1 sure -- the Commission sort of -- could certainly
2 do a special agenda meeting if they wanted to.
3 And I put "DBD" -- "TBD" for the order day
4 because I don't believe that the statute
5 specifically requires the Commission to -- to issue
6 an order by a certain date.

7 MS. BOYD: All right.

8 MR. MELCHERS: (Inaudible.)

9 MR. BURGESS: Oh, yeah. I was thinking --

10 MR. MELCHERS: (Inaudible) like you had recent
11 experience --

12 MR. BURGESS: Of course.

13 MR. MELCHERS: -- with order dates --

14 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. Of course.

15 MR. MELCHERS: -- set by the statute.

16 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

17 MS. BOYD: All right. And any other comments on the
18 voluntary renewable letter?

19 MS. HIPPIE: This is a question, Chad: Do you read the
20 statute (inaudible) flexibility (inaudible) --

21 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. Let me -- that's a good question
22 because some places in the statute they
23 specifically call for an evidentiary hearing. I
24 don't --

25 MS. HIPPIE: (Inaudible.)

1 MR. BURGESS: Do you remember reading one in that
2 section? I -- I don't --
3 MS. HIPPIE: I don't, and that's --
4 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.
5 MS. HIPPIE: -- why I just wanted to make sure we were on
6 the same --
7 MS. DULIN: "Shall conduct a" (inaudible) . . .
8 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.
9 MS. HIPPIE: You have to have a hearing?
10 MR. NELSON: (Inaudible.)
11 MS. HIPPIE: Okay.
12 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.
13 MS. HIPPIE: We had that -- or I had that (inaudible).
14 MR. GISSENDANNER: (Inaudible) statement, though.
15 MS. SMITH: Yeah. I think where it says --
16 MR. GISSENDANNER: (Inaudible.)
17 MR. MELCHERS: (Inaudible) proceeding with a hearing
18 officer (inaudible) flexibility (inaudible).
19 MR. GISSENDANNER: (Inaudible.)
20 MR. BURGESS: In the regs?
21 MR. GISSENDANNER: In the regs?
22 MS. BOYD: It is. I think it is.
23 MR. GISSENDANNER: Okay. (Inaudible) required
24 (inaudible).
25 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

1 MS. SMITH: Instead of the opportunity --

2 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

3 MR. GISSENDANNER: Yeah.

4 MS. SMITH: -- it's required?

5 MR. BURGESS: So, you know, I mean, if -- if you wanted
6 to make that a paper filing, I guess. You know,
7 more flexibility, Joseph.

8 MR. MELCHERS: (Nods head up and down.)

9 MR. BURGESS: Absolutely. Okay. So that's all I had on
10 the voluntary renewable energy program docket,
11 Jocelyn.

12 MS. BOYD: All right.

13 MR. BURGESS: So the interconnection standards. In the
14 interest of continuing the conversation with Joseph
15 and giving flexibility, with all due respect, I --
16 I -- I don't think the Commission got the statute
17 right.

18 MS. BOYD: On interconnection?

19 MR. BURGESS: On interconnection.

20 MS. BOYD: All right.

21 MR. BURGESS: And that was with respect to Subsection D.
22 I -- I think Subsection D's actually talking about
23 -- it's not setting a deadline for the Commission
24 to take action by August -- before August 16th.
25 That's -- that language is actually designed for

1 certain renewable energy generators who -- who --
2 who execute a system impact study agreement with
3 the utility. And it's more of a -- at least my
4 reading of it is it's more of a grandfather clause
5 for those -- for those folks, as opposed to setting
6 a hard deadline for the Commission to establish
7 guidelines with respect to system impact study
8 agreement timelines. And, Hamilton, I don't know
9 if --

10 MR. DAVIS: Yeah. We -- we agree, Jocelyn, with -- with
11 Chad -- Chad's reading of that.

12 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

13 MR. DAVIS: It -- it's poor -- it's poorly drafted
14 probably by somebody sitting in this room -- maybe
15 me or Jamey. That it -- it does look initially
16 like it refers to -- that deadline refers to the
17 Commission decision but it's actually which
18 projects actually would qualify for the -- the
19 timelines to be set by the Commission, and that's
20 -- that's just an open-ended requirement. And the
21 Commission can set -- make that decision as they
22 see fit.

23 MR. BURGESS: And I did get a letter on that one,
24 Jocelyn.

25 MS. BOYD: Okay. I'm wondering on this other one --

1 MR. BURGESS: I got a letter on that one.

2 MS. BOYD: Yeah. You should've received the other one,
3 too, because it had a deadline. I -- I'll find
4 that before you-all leave.

5 MR. BURGESS: Okay.

6 MS. BOYD: Was it -- what's going on there.

7 Okay. So now, you're -- what you're saying is
8 you don't think -- please repeat it. You don't
9 think the Commission --

10 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. So here is the way we're reading
11 this.

12 MS. BOYD: Okay.

13 MR. BURGESS: It's in D.

14 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

15 MR. BURGESS: And it's the second sentence, which reads,
16 "The Commission shall establish reasonable
17 guidelines to ensure reasonable interconnection
18 timelines, including time requirements to deliver a
19 final system impact study to all interconnection
20 customers that execute a system impact study
21 agreement prior to three months after the effective
22 date of this act." So --

23 MS. BOYD: Oh. We were proactive.

24 MR. BURGESS: -- prior to -- yeah. So -- so we're --
25 we're saying that that timeline actually modifies

1 the clause right in front of it, which --

2 MS. BOYD: Okay.

3 UNDETERMINED: The part before it.

4 MR. BURGESS: -- in -- in the entity there -- that's
5 right.

6 MS. BOYD: Oh, okay.

7 MR. BURGESS: And, also, you know, there other places in
8 the statute, you know, when the Commission is
9 required to do something by a certain date --

10 MS. BOYD: Yes.

11 MR. BURGESS: -- you'll see how they've -- that's
12 written a little tighter to be clearer --

13 MS. BOYD: Okay. Okay.

14 MR. BURGESS: -- that that's the Commission's duty, but
15 we don't interpret this as being the Commission's
16 duty to do something by -- by August 15th. That's
17 actually -- again, it's a grandfather clause --

18 MS. BOYD: Okay.

19 MR. BURGESS: -- to allow folks who execute a system
20 impact study agreement --

21 MS. BOYD: Prior to --

22 MR. BURGESS: -- today --

23 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

24 MR. BURGESS: -- they're going to -- they're going to --
25 they're going to be following the guidelines that

1 later get approved by the Commission.

2 MS. BOYD: But if they had established -- if they were
3 part of the process -- I see May. So April, March,
4 February.

5 MR. GISSENDANNER: But, Jocelyn, this is actually --

6 MS. BOYD: Oh, after the effective date.

7 MR. GISSENDANNER: Yeah. After. After.

8 MR. BURGESS: Right. After. So you've got to go from
9 May --

10 MS. BOYD: After the effective date. Yeah. May.

11 MR. BURGESS: -- May to August this year.

12 MS. BOYD: Yeah. Oh.

13 MR. DAVIS: So this should be a -- a major relief to the
14 Commission.

15 MS. BOYD: That's what --

16 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. So --

17 MS. BOYD: We did all that work.

18 MR. BURGESS: I know. I know. And -- and --

19 MS. BOYD: No. This is great. I'm glad y'all brought
20 this up because -- well, you know, I just -- I at
21 times -- I prefer --

22 MR. MELCHERS: Get that in writing.

23 MR. DAVIS: Yeah.

24 MR. BURGESS: It is. It is in writing.

25 MR. DAVIS: (Inaudible) deliver.

1 MS. BOYD: I prefer -- I like being conservative,
2 though, Joseph. I like the fact --
3 MR. MELCHERS: I know.
4 MS. BOYD: Even though it was more work, that -- that's
5 great. That's great.
6 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.
7 MS. BOYD: We're not -- that's great. All right. So
8 I'll have to take that back to the Commission.
9 Thank you for saying that. Beautiful.
10 MR. GISSENDANNER: And that's be part of the
11 interconnection docket.
12 MR. BURGESS: Right.
13 MS. BOYD: Yes. Yes.
14 MR. BURGESS: Right.
15 MS. BOYD: Yes. We -- y'all saw we were stressing that
16 at the last --
17 MR. BURGESS: I did. I did and -- and --
18 MS. BOYD: "Y'all got to do this. You've got to do
19 this."
20 MR. BURGESS: I -- I couldn't believe you couldn't hear
21 me through my computer at home. No.
22 MS. BOYD: But I'm glad you went -- that's great.
23 That's great. That's great. Okay.
24 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. So that'll -- that'll --
25 MS. BOYD: That will make --

1 MR. BURGESS: That'll --

2 MS. BOYD: Chad, I don't -- no. We haven't gotten to

3 the interconnection dockets yet.

4 MR. BURGESS: That -- that's what -- D is

5 interconnection guidelines.

6 MS. BOYD: Yes.

7 MR. BURGESS: A talks about interconnection "standards"

8 -- I believe is the word they use --

9 MR. DAVIS: Proceedings.

10 MR. BURGESS: From --

11 MS. DULIN: Chad, before you go on to A, can I just --

12 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. Sure.

13 MS. DULIN: I have a question about D. Can -- we did

14 receive the letter for the section where --

15 MS. BOYD: Yes.

16 MS. DULIN: -- you guys, you know, were operating on a

17 very expedited time frame based on the, you know,

18 expectation --

19 MS. BOYD: Right.

20 MS. DULIN: -- that a decision had to be made in August.

21 MS. BOYD: Right.

22 MS. DULIN: So right now I think it's a July 3rd

23 deadline that we had.

24 MS. BOYD: That's right.

25 MR. BURGESS: Right. Yeah.

1 MS. DULIN: That is a -- a rather heavy lift.

2 MS. BOYD: Yeah.

3 MS. DULIN: And so I -- we're happy to file a comment in
4 that docket asking --

5 MS. BOYD: Or stating you disagree.

6 MS. DULIN: Happy to do that.

7 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

8 MS. DULIN: Just for, you know, resources --

9 MS. BOYD: Sure.

10 MS. DULIN: -- and efficiency, if that might be amended,
11 then, you know, to have all hands on deck to meet
12 in 20 days right now if we move forward with that,
13 if that's what you needed to do, trying to think
14 how to (inaudible) because 20 days is a pretty
15 short period of time.

16 MS. BOYD: Yeah. But, Rebecca, I'm wondering if -- I
17 don't know that they're going to want to rule the
18 same.

19 MS. DULIN: Uh-huh.

20 MS. BOYD: Because this applies to the customers --

21 MS. DULIN: Right.

22 MS. BOYD: -- who are participating, basically, within
23 three months --

24 MS. DULIN: Uh-huh.

25 MS. BOYD: -- after the act has become effective. So I

1 think that they might want -- we might revisit the
2 entire issue.

3 MS. DULIN: (Inaudible) that.

4 MS. BOYD: Yeah. I don't think -- I think -- Joseph,
5 would you agree with me? -- that the whole thing
6 needs to be --

7 MR. MELCHERS: I would. I would write, you know,
8 letters in response to that letter --

9 MS. DULIN: Okay. We're happy to do that.

10 MR. MELCHERS: -- for clarification.

11 MS. BOYD: Yes. Yes.

12 MR. MELCHERS: If y'all want to make it a joint letter.

13 MR. DAVIS: Yeah.

14 MS. BOYD: Right. That's perfect.

15 MR. DAVIS: We're happy to do that, too, yeah.

16 MS. DULIN: Yeah. Okay. Great.

17 MS. HIPPI: (Inaudible) move in a different direction
18 before that deadline, still that deadline's so
19 tight so (inaudible) --

20 MR. DAVIS: Meaning --

21 MS. BOYD: Oh, you mean the interconnection docket --
22 dockets, potentially.

23 MS. HIPPI: The letter that went out to all of us that
24 required --

25 MS. BOYD: Yes.

1 MS. HIPPI: -- an interconnection kind of guideline draft
2 that established (inaudible) to not require that
3 deadline.

4 MS. BOYD: Right.

5 MS. HIPPI: We will be marching toward that deadline
6 (inaudible) --

7 MS. BOYD: Well, don't you think we could do something
8 like a standing hearing officer just holding all
9 that in --

10 MR. MELCHERS: (Nods head up and down.)

11 MS. HIPPI: Oh, okay.

12 MS. DULIN: Yeah. That --

13 MS. BOYD: Yeah. I -- I wouldn't -- I would not stress
14 that. I -- I do think -- what Joseph said, though,
15 if you-all please don't mind -- even if it's a
16 combined letter, please give us a letter stating
17 your interpretation that -- of -- meaning the fact
18 that that -- that the prior to three months refers
19 to the customers and not the Commissions taking
20 action.

21 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

22 MR. GISSENDANNER: (Inaudible) people file those letters
23 and then (inaudible) --

24 MS. BOYD: Yes.

25 MR. GISSENDANNER: -- (inaudible).

1 MS. BOYD: Yeah. I think I -- we could do that.

2 MR. MELCHERS: (Inaudible.)

3 MS. BOYD: Right.

4 MS. DULIN: Do you need -- sorry. Just briefly: Do you
5 need -- do you need the letter from us first before
6 you --

7 MR. MELCHERS: Yes.

8 MS. DULIN: Okay. Gotcha. Thank you.

9 MR. BURGESS: That's good. Okay. So going back to
10 interconnection. So, Jocelyn, from our viewpoint,
11 we think there should be one interconnection
12 docket --

13 MS. BOYD: Oh.

14 MR. BURGESS: -- which addresses A and D, and the reason
15 for that is system -- the system impact
16 agreement --

17 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

18 MR. BURGESS: -- system impact study agreement is --
19 that's included in part of the interconnection
20 standards today.

21 MS. BOYD: Okay.

22 MR. BURGESS: So we didn't -- we didn't see a need to
23 break that out into two specific dockets. So
24 there's -- we think there should be one
25 interconnection docket to deal with all those

1 issues. And then, secondly, you'll see where the
2 interconnection docket really doesn't get going
3 from a utility perspective until January 2020.

4 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

5 MR. BURGESS: And this is really a function of a couple
6 things. Number 1, it's trying to balance the
7 workload with respect to all the moving parts that
8 are in the -- in the -- in the -- in the
9 legislation. But, secondly, and more importantly,
10 is in order to address any perceived issues in
11 interconnection, you need to know what those issues
12 are, and a lot of those issues are not going to be
13 readily defined until we get out of the standard
14 offer interconnection -- or, excuse me, standard
15 offer and avoided cost docket. For example, if
16 there is an avoided cost that is implemented in the
17 standard offer docket --

18 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

19 MR. BURGESS: -- and that's an avoided cost that solar
20 developers like and it works for their business
21 model, then we're going to see -- or we would
22 expect to see solar developers entering into the
23 interconnection queue at a more rapid pace than
24 they otherwise would --

25 MS. BOYD: Yeah.

1 MR. BURGESS: -- if the avoided cost doesn't meet what
2 they need for their -- their business model.

3 So knowing that in advance, that will actually
4 help drive some of the decisions that -- and -- in
5 fact, and also some of the arguments that get made
6 in the interconnection docket. So it's better to
7 -- in our mind, it's better to let's get the
8 avoided cost issue resolved, have the Commission
9 issue an order, know what the landscape looks like
10 from who's going to be now entering into the
11 interconnection queue, and then we're able to craft
12 guidelines and standards in order to try to get
13 those parties through that queue sooner rather than
14 later if that's what those developers are wanting.

15 MS. BOYD: All right. Thank you. Hamilton?

16 MR. DAVIS: I -- I generally agree with -- with what
17 Chad had to say there. I don't know that January
18 is the right time to initiate those proceedings.
19 The statute says six months to initiate proceedings
20 and then I -- again, I anticipate that we're going
21 to need to have some -- this -- this isn't just
22 going to be a matter of -- and maybe, Chad, this is
23 just imprecise how this is -- how -- how this is
24 articulated here in your document. The IOU has
25 "direct testimony" -- "direct testimony or

1 filings." But, again, I think this is going to be,
2 most likely, a joint proceeding, just how the GIP
3 was developed, and -- and so contemplating things
4 like energy storage and -- and other issues that
5 come out of the avoided cost dockets will probably
6 need to be done in a single docket to update the
7 state generator interconnection procedures.

8 MR. BURGESS: Sure. Yeah. No. I certainly understand
9 what you're saying with respect to this docket
10 being consolidated because it's going to be a set
11 of standards that would be --

12 MR. DAVIS: Right.

13 MR. BURGESS: -- applicable across all -- all utilities.
14 I think the Commission has already established
15 their statutory requirement as far as opening the
16 docket.

17 MR. DAVIS: By opening the docket, that initiates the
18 proceedings.

19 MR. BURGESS: I think -- I think we're good there. And,
20 again, this is just Number 1. When I kind of think
21 about this from a Gantt-chart perspective trying to
22 just line up the scopes of work that everybody's
23 got to do, this gives -- there's no requirement
24 that we get this done within six months. Again,
25 the Commission's already done what they're required

1 to do from opening the docket. But this also gives
2 us a little bit of room to maybe understand how
3 these issues may materialize from an avoided cost
4 standpoint and --

5 MR. DAVIS: I -- I -- I generally agree with that. Just
6 -- we just haven't put an exact date or month on
7 the calendar as to what we'd prefer.

8 MR. BURGESS: Okay.

9 MR. DAVIS: But we're certainly not looking to
10 accelerate this and overlap it in any significant
11 way with the avoided cost proceedings --

12 MR. BURGESS: Okay.

13 MR. DAVIS: -- recognizing that that's going to be all
14 consuming to some extent.

15 MR. BURGESS: Okay.

16 MS. BOYD: May I ask something while we're going through
17 this is y'all haven't -- you -- your -- you and
18 your client haven't decided yet and maybe others
19 haven't. Maybe we can use this as a working
20 document, so perhaps we can use -- Bland and Jamey,
21 if your clients differ, like with any of these
22 dates, maybe you can just file -- strike through
23 and file. I think that would be helpful.

24 UNDETERMINED: Chad, can you send us the --

25 MR. BURGESS: I'll be happy to. So I'll just hit "reply

1 all" on Afton's meeting request --

2 MS. BOYD: Okay.

3 MR. BURGESS: -- and send that out electronically.

4 MS. BOYD: Yeah. I think -- and then that --I think

5 that will help all of us.

6 MS. SMITH: I would just say that some of this is

7 (inaudible) --

8 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. Thank you, Heather. Yeah. I

9 don't --

10 MS. SMITH:

11 MR. BURGESS: I mean, I'm not speaking for Duke. I love

12 them, but they've got their own lawyer, so --

13 MS. SMITH: Yeah. I mean, I don't -- yeah.

14 Particularly in that first column.

15 MS. BOYD: Yeah.

16 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

17 MS. SMITH: And the IRP.

18 MS. BOYD: Okay.

19 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

20 MS. SMITH: So maybe we drop those two (inaudible).

21 MR. BURGESS: Sure.

22 MS. BOYD: Okay. Does that -- does work for everybody

23 so that we're all looking at the same-type

24 information? Okay.

25 MS. HIPPE: Can I just double-check? We've got right now

1 three dockets on interconnection -- four actually
2 including (inaudible) --
3 MR. BURGESS: Uh-huh.
4 MS. BOYD: Yes. With -- there are four.
5 MS. HIPPI: So the discussion is coalescing around having
6 one docket --
7 MR. BURGESS: I think that --
8 MS. HIPPI: -- for the standard, right?
9 MR. BURGESS: -- makes sense for this particular issue,
10 yes.
11 MS. HIPPI: Okay.
12 MS. FOX: Well, can I just say for my part, I have
13 (inaudible).
14 MS. BOYD: Okay.
15 MS. HIPPI: Are there individual issues within that
16 action, though, (inaudible) --
17 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.
18 MS. HIPPI: -- required to (inaudible)?
19 MR. BURGESS: I think the statute indicates what's -- I
20 don't think they're utility specific.
21 MS. HIPPI: Right. I didn't --
22 MR. BURGESS: I -- I think it's just --
23 MS. HIPPI: Okay.
24 MR. BURGESS: -- generic in nature, and the statute
25 explains to the Commission and the -- and -- and

1 the utilities and other parties what's expected of
2 -- of those -- of those standards.

3 MS. SMITH: Just to reiterate a consolidated docket
4 (inaudible) Duke.

5 MS. BOYD: Instead -- so when you-all say consolidate
6 two, do you mean just consolidate for hearing
7 purposes, or maybe the Commission should
8 reconsider --

9 MR. BURGESS: No. I think -- Jocelyn, I think this will
10 -- this will more or less mirror the
11 interconnection standard docket that we had a few
12 years ago --

13 MS. BOYD: Okay.

14 MR. BURGESS: -- where, if my memory's right, I think
15 Duke and --

16 MS. SMITH: Yeah.

17 MR. BURGESS: -- at the time, SCE&G jointly initiated
18 that docket. And then we worked with the other
19 parties on getting standards set up.

20 MS. BOYD: So basically when -- I think when they voted
21 to open the four dockets, you-all think that
22 perhaps they should consider just having one
23 docket.

24 MR. BURGESS: Subject -- subject to what Peg said for
25 her client.

1 MS. BOYD: Oh, yes.

2 MR. BURGESS: But, yeah, that's right.

3 MS. BOYD: Okay.

4 MR. GISSENDANNER: Consolidated for (inaudible).

5 MS. BOYD: All right. Does anyone have a differing
6 opinion -- or different opinion?

7 Thank you. Thank you for that.

8 MR. BURGESS: All right. So net meter -- net metering
9 -- net energy metering. You know, we think the
10 statute has kind of got folks squared away with net
11 metering from those folks who -- who actually -- I
12 think it was they submit an application by a
13 certain date and they're going to be -- they're --
14 they'll get the current net metering rate until
15 2029. So they've got a -- a ten-year runway with
16 respect to that. So we didn't -- we did not see
17 the need to turn a -- net metering into some rocket
18 docket, if you will, and we can actually kind of
19 press pause on that for the time being, with the
20 exception -- and what we did is we worked backward
21 from the solar value tariff that's in this --
22 that's in the -- in the statute.

23 MS. BOYD: Right.

24 MR. BURGESS: And I think that's got a -- that has a
25 requirement of April 30th of 2021 -- or -- I'm

1 sorry. It might be a little earlier than that.

2 Let me see here.

3 MS. BOYD: Is that the solar choice?

4 MR. BURGESS: That was the solar choice, yeah.

5 MR. MUSTIAN: It was May 31st.

6 MR. BURGESS: So our thinking there was to -- yeah. It
7 was May 31st. Thank you, Ben.

8 MS. BOYD: Chad, which statute is that? Do you recall?

9 Oh, here it is. I've got it. (F)(1).

10 MR. BURGESS: Yeah.

11 MS. HIPPIE: (F)(1), yeah.

12 MS. BOYD: (F)(1). Uh-huh. Thank you.

13 MR. BURGESS: Right. So we didn't see any need to press
14 the accelerator on that docket. I think the
15 Commission has -- you've already opened the docket.
16 I don't think you have any other statutory
17 obligations with respect to that docket other than
18 the solar value tariff, and these dates are
19 designed so that the Commission can make sure it
20 hits that deadline.

21 I -- Hamilton, I don't know how y'all feel
22 about that.

23 MR. DAVIS: I haven't heard any -- I think everyone I've
24 spoken with in the solar community is comfortable
25 with that --

1 MR. BURGESS: Okay.

2 MR. DAVIS: -- approach as well.

3 MR. BURGESS: All right.

4 MS. BOYD: Wonderful. Anyone else have any points to --
5 great.

6 MR. BURGESS: Okay. And then last and certainly not
7 least is IRP. I did, again, watch the debate --
8 not a debate -- the Commission's agenda meeting on
9 -- on Wednesday.

10 MS. BOYD: Yeah.

11 MR. BURGESS: And I want to speak for Dominion here.
12 Obviously, we have filed our IRP back in February.
13 We did that pursuant to Commission order.

14 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

15 MR. BURGESS: The various parties who have an interest
16 in that docket have submitted comments, and the
17 docket is in the position in which it's in. We
18 certainly don't believe that there's any
19 requirement under the statute that demands Dominion
20 to now refile its IRP to conform with the law that
21 was just enacted last month.

22 What our thought process was -- is that when
23 February rolls around for next year -- is that we
24 would file an IRP that would include all of the
25 requirements that the statute requires the IRP to

1 include; the Commission would set up a docket with
2 respect to that IRP, and then folks could engage in
3 discovery, and we'd -- we'd follow the statutory
4 parameters that are set out for that -- for that
5 IRP. So again, in -- in this one, we used December
6 25th here. I -- I know that's not when the PSC's
7 going to vote on something, but the PSC does have a
8 time limit of --

9 MS. BOYD: I was going to tell you Jesus would not be
10 happy.

11 MR. BURGESS: Hey. I -- yeah. And, you know, as a
12 disciple of Jesus, I agree with Him on that.

13 So -- but -- but in any event, the Commission
14 has 300 days --

15 MS. BOYD: Okay.

16 MR. BURGESS: -- by which to -- to make a ruling, and
17 that's -- that's the 300th day.

18 MS. BOYD: Okay.

19 MR. BURGESS: So, obviously, I would expect the
20 Commission to -- to move that date around earlier
21 than that.

22 MS. BOYD: Okay.

23 MR. BURGESS: But that's what's done there.

24 And then I would also expect that, once the
25 return date passes, folks obviously are intervening

1 in that docket, and the -- and there will be a
2 procedural schedule that will get set up to address
3 the issues in -- in the IRP docket.

4 MS. BOYD: All right.

5 MR. GISSENDANNER: Jocelyn, I would -- I would also just
6 point out that February 28th --

7 MS. BOYD: Yeah.

8 MR. GISSENDANNER: The Commission required us to file in
9 February --

10 MS. BOYD: Right. Because of the --

11 MR. GISSENDANNER: (Inaudible.)

12 MR. BURGESS: Right.

13 MS. BOYD: Yes.

14 MR. GISSENDANNER: (Inaudible.)

15 MS. BOYD: Right.

16 MR. GISSENDANNER: Our -- our IRP filing (inaudible) --

17 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

18 MR. GISSENDANNER: -- (inaudible) --

19 MS. BOYD: Okay.

20 MR. BURGESS: Right.

21 MR. GISSENDANNER: -- (inaudible) filing.

22 MS. BOYD: All right. Okay. Before we get to Duke and
23 Lockhart, y'all, I'm just curious: Where do --
24 where do you-all, please, stand on that?

25 MR. DAVIS: So I think that we don't -- we -- I agree

1 with Chad that the utilities aren't required to
2 refile IRPs in 2019 that this is a 2020 timeline
3 that we're talking about. I think we see this in a
4 similar fashion to the avoided cost proceedings,
5 though, where there -- there are some threshold
6 issues that the Commission needs to decide on the
7 front end. So whether that's a -- I don't know
8 using the term "consolidate" -- "consolidated
9 proceeding" is -- is right here. It may just be
10 the Commission needs to initiate a proceeding to
11 establish guidelines or produce an order that sets
12 the expectations for compliance with the statute,
13 the Commission interpretation of the statute, and
14 -- and exactly what requirements -- the
15 interpretation of the statutory requirements for
16 the utilities to comply.

17 MS. BOYD: Now, let me ask you this, Bland: Would you
18 think that that would fall --

19 MR. DAVIS: Hamilton.

20 MS. BOYD: I'm sorry.

21 MR. DAVIS: Bland's getting uncomfortable being compared
22 to me.

23 MR. HOLMAN: You're doing a great job.

24 MS. BOYD: I know your name. I apologize.

25 MR. DAVIS: I know you do.

1 MS. BOYD: Hamilton, I apologize. How many times have I
2 done that?

3 MR. DAVIS: Only once.

4 MS. BOYD: Oh, good. Okay. I apologize.

5 Would you -- are you thinking that they should
6 use the Subsection E under the integrated -- what
7 is 30 -- 37 -- 58-37-40(E) where it says about the
8 promulgating regulations? Are you thinking about
9 that when you -- you talk about setting these --

10 MR. DAVIS: I don't know that regulations need to be
11 set. I know that in the past the Commission's held
12 proceedings to -- to generally just establish what
13 -- what those -- what the expectations are of the
14 -- the utilities in their filings. And so we do
15 have statutory guidance now that's fairly specific.

16 MS. BOYD: Okay.

17 MR. DAVIS: But I think that, if we don't have
18 additional Commission guidance, then we potentially
19 have -- you -- I mean, you -- then you -- then
20 you're -- you have the utilities interpreting the
21 statute as they will, absent Commission --
22 Commission guidance.

23 MS. BOYD: Okay.

24 MR. DAVIS: And, rather than getting into a situation
25 where we think the -- we think the statute says one

1 thing, the utilities think it says something

2 else --

3 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

4 MR. DAVIS: -- they file and then there's a contested

5 proceeding trying to resolve that --

6 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

7 MR. DAVIS -- on the back side, let's have some guidance

8 and consistency in the front end. And we have -- I

9 think the timelines we're working on give us plenty

10 of opportunity to do that. There -- there isn't --

11 MS. BOYD: I believe --

12 MR. DAVIS: I know SC -- or Dominion is -- is suggesting

13 here that they would file in February of 2020.

14 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

15 MR. DAVIS: That's certainly not required by statute,

16 and it may be that we can push that timeline out if

17 need be. The -- the other -- I mean, the -- the

18 bigger concern here is that these updated IRPs are

19 going to have a disproportionate impact on avoided

20 cost filings eventually. Obviously, we're not

21 going to be able to do that for this year. We're

22 going to have a -- an updated avoided cost

23 methodology and rate filed prior to the IRPs being

24 updated, but we need to have that conversation

25 about how we -- how quickly we can get those two

1 things aligned. Otherwise, we're going to be
2 potentially operating with an IRP on a three-year
3 cycle and -- and not updating avoided costs for as
4 long as maybe two years. I mean, that's the --
5 that's the parameters set forth in the -- the
6 statute. But, of course, the Commission has the
7 authority to -- to -- to require what they think is
8 in the best interest of the parties involved and --
9 and customers.

10 So I think this -- this is just a -- this is a
11 complicated aspect of the legislation that's not
12 sequenced in an ideal way because that's just the
13 way it fell out, and the Commission's going to have
14 to make some decisions as to how they want to
15 handle it.

16 MS. BOYD: Okay. So may I ask this: So what tool would
17 you suggest? Because I -- this is maybe not the
18 regulation process; I agree with you. We're not
19 going to be able to accomplish that anyway before
20 next February or whenever they file. Are you
21 thinking a generic proceeding or are you thinking
22 just a hearing, which they can do? Under just
23 their regulations, they can schedule an entire
24 hearing.

25 MR. DAVIS: I think probably a generic proceeding

1 where --

2 MR. GISSENDANNER: What -- what's the purpose of that?

3 MS. BOYD: Well, I --

4 MR. DAVIS: To issue guidelines. The --

5 MR. GISSENDANNER: I mean, you've got the statutory

6 guidelines, and the Commission has to review the

7 IRP before you file it. And if you don't meet --

8 if they say you don't meet the statutory

9 guidelines, that's what you (inaudible) and say you

10 don't meet it --

11 MR. BURGESS: And actually you'd have to --

12 MR. DAVIS: That's -- that's an approach they could

13 take.

14 MR. BURGESS: And you'd refile.

15 MR. GISSENDANNER: I don't really -- I don't really see

16 what the point is of --

17 MR. BURGESS: Right.

18 MR. GISSENDANNER: -- having a proceeding to, you know,

19 talk about it here, and then have another

20 proceeding when we file our -- when we actually

21 file our IRP and identify another problem and raise

22 those issues (inaudible). But the procedure is

23 what's set forth in the statute.

24 MR. DAVIS: We have a procedure set forth in statute

25 today, and we have very different approaches taken

1 by Duke Energy and -- and SCE&G in the past. And
2 this is -- again, this legislation is -- is a
3 comprehensive kind of reset on how we're deciding
4 these issues in South Carolina. And I --

5 MR. GISSENDANNER: Do we not have a --

6 MR. DAVIS: I appreciate that you don't agree with me,
7 Matt.

8 MR. GISSENDANNER: Do we not have a procedure set forth
9 in the statute today where the Commission approves
10 an IRP and then if they don't approve it, send it
11 back --

12 MR. DAVIS: IRPs are required under statute today and
13 there are --

14 MR. GISSENDANNER: They're required to be filed.

15 MR. DAVIS: -- certain elements that are required to be
16 in there. And the Commission has issued orders in
17 the past that have provided guidance to utilities
18 as to what needs to be in there and -- and what's
19 expected.

20 MR. GISSENDANNER: But there is nothing in the statute
21 today, other than the law that was just passed,
22 that requires the Commission approve or reject an
23 IRP (inaudible), and you know that.

24 MR. DAVIS: And I also know that we -- we're going to
25 disagree on all kind of issues. We're not trying

1 to establish what's right and wrong today. I'm
2 providing Jocelyn with our opinion as to how this
3 should -- how this should flow.

4 MS. SMITH: And -- and --

5 MR. DAVIS: And -- and so those are our thoughts and --
6 and we'll be filing those in writing next week
7 based on the Commission request on Wednesday to --
8 to provide this feedback.

9 MS. SMITH: Okay. And our view is the statute is
10 incredibly prescriptive. There is so much detail
11 in the statute to (inaudible) encompasses all of
12 this (inaudible). And so, you know, it's the
13 utility's burden to file a comprehensive IRP every
14 three years upon those guidelines and the
15 sufficiency of that Commission filing --
16 sufficiency of the Company's filing could be
17 determined on a factual basis in that docket. So I
18 don't know -- there's nothing in the statute that
19 would require, nor do I really think it's
20 incredibly productive, to have an administrative
21 proceeding not required by statute on the front end
22 on how to interpret the statute. That's the
23 utility's burden when it submits its IRP.

24 MR. BURGESS: And, Jocelyn, I would just add to that
25 that --

1 MR. HOLMAN: Do you not want these regulations at all?

2 MS. SMITH: I mean, I -- I --

3 MR. BURGESS: I don't think you need them.

4 MS. SMITH: Yeah.

5 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. I don't -- I don't think you need
6 the regulations, and also if --

7 MR. HOLMAN: Would you be opposed to it? The statute
8 says they can do it.

9 MR. BURGESS: I think that's up to the Commission.
10 Yeah.

11 MR. HOLMAN: (Inaudible.)

12 MR. BURGESS: If they -- if they wanted to --

13 MR. HOLMAN: If they think it's helpful to have
14 guidelines --

15 MR. BURGESS: If they -- if they think they need to
16 promulgate --

17 MR. HOLMAN: -- (inaudible) in advance --

18 MR. BURGESS: Right. But I think --

19 MS. SMITH: (Inaudible.)

20 MR. HOLMAN: -- (inaudible) make that decision.

21 MR. BURGESS: The Commission absolutely has that right.

22 MR. SMITH: Promulgated by the Commission.

23 MR. BURGESS: The other thing that I would add, Jocelyn,
24 is that, if a party wishes for the Commission to
25 interpret a statute, the appropriate vehicle by

1 which to do that is a declaratory judgment action.

2 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

3 MR. BURGESS: Those get filed at this Commission
4 periodically. I've seen it done; I've done it
5 myself. So to the extent that -- if Hamilton and
6 his clients want the Commission to define a term or
7 -- or they want to advance on what something means,
8 I think -- I think they would need to initiate the
9 docket in which to do that. I don't think that
10 needs to be done, to Matt's point. I think we'd be
11 plowing the ground twice.

12 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

13 MR. BURGESS: There's already a procedure that's put in
14 place for which -- and Hamilton and his clients are
15 not -- they're certainly not waiving, and I think
16 they're, in fact, probably -- they have all their
17 rights reserved by which to take issue with the
18 utility if they wish to do that on -- on our
19 interpretation of what the statute requires to be
20 included in an IRP. And then, also -- and -- and I
21 think the General Assembly thought this through --
22 is that, if -- if the utility did get it wrong and
23 the Commission finds that they did, there's a right
24 to cure provision in here which requires the
25 utility to go back to the drawing board --

1 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

2 MR. BURGESS: -- reform the IRP consistent with the
3 Commission's order and refile it. So I hate to --
4 to -- I understand Hamilton's point about trying to
5 put up some guardrails at the get-go, but I -- I --
6 I don't think that that serves judicial economy and
7 is efficient mechanism, given what we have in the
8 statute here.

9 MS. BOYD: Okay. Hey, Dawn.

10 MS. HIPPE: Notwithstanding that there's any substantive
11 (inaudible) about what (inaudible) looks like
12 (inaudible) there's a lot of that and the statute
13 (inaudible). The folks that have to review the
14 IRPs, it would be helpful if you told us
15 (inaudible) how you analyze -- how the utility
16 analyzes it, but it could it be, you know, a table
17 of contents and your IRP has to have this order.
18 For those that will be seeing these multiple times,
19 it would be helpful to get some of that determined
20 or agreed upon, you know, how you reflected -- you
21 know, in terms of which chart to put in and what
22 analysis of (inaudible) you need done. Those are
23 the areas I think that we have to agree upon. The
24 fact that it's (inaudible) and it's, you know, in
25 sections labeled 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 would be helpful.

1 And so if that's a guideline written by the
2 Commission such that (inaudible) guideline --

3 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

4 MS. HIPPE: -- for South Carolina or something
5 (inaudible), but that would be helpful.

6 (Inaudible.)

7 MS. BOYD: Okay. I see -- as I said, I'm not a sitting
8 Commissioner, but I see both of your points, but I
9 do think that your point should be filed, please.
10 I will make sure I express your positions to the
11 chair, but I just -- I think it's important because
12 there are -- there's a -- you don't agree right
13 now, but whatever we can kind of work through
14 that's not substantive before the hearing I think
15 is helpful for everyone.

16 MR. BURGESS: Sure.

17 MS. BOYD: So if you don't -- if you don't mind filing
18 your comments and your recommendations. Dawn,
19 including what you said, if ORS would do that. I
20 just think all of that helps before we get to a
21 hearing and they can focus more on the substantive
22 issues.

23 MR. BURGESS: Okay.

24 MS. BOYD: I think it's helpful for the Commissioners.

25 MS. DULIN: And, Jocelyn, I just want --

1 MS. BOYD: Now --

2 MS. DULIN: Yeah. I just thought it would be helpful to
3 offer, from Duke's standpoint, we have not filed
4 our IRPs yet this year.

5 MS. BOYD: Yes.

6 MS. DULIN: So what we intend to do is to -- given the
7 amount of work that it takes to adjust the IRP in
8 order to incorporate these new requirements that
9 are in here, I think what we're intending to do is
10 to file our IRP at -- at the status quo, if you
11 will, for 2019, understanding that the bench may
12 interpret or ORS may take the position that the
13 provisions of the update here apply. And so I'm
14 (inaudible) -- so --

15 MS. HIPPI: No. We -- we fully interpreted this to mean
16 that the 2019 IRPs can be filed under (inaudible).

17 MS. BOYD: Okay.

18 MS. HIPPI: Whether it's (inaudible) or not, that would
19 (inaudible).

20 MS. DULIN: So Duke would file its -- or the two Duke
21 utilities would file their comprehensive IRPs in
22 2020 and then -- so currently we have a biannual
23 schedule, and this year is scheduled to be an
24 update year anyway. So that works to go ahead and
25 continue with the updates here this year and then

1 file a comprehensive IRP compliant with the
2 statute. And we'll file comments to that extent.

3 MS. SMITH: In other words, we're going to print out a
4 schedule saying that (inaudible) comprehensive
5 updates on that schedule.

6 MS. BOYD: Peg, did you have anything you wanted to --
7 you want to add right now about Lockhart?

8 MS. FOX: No.

9 MS. BOYD: Not right now?

10 MS. FOX: No. Their IRP (inaudible).

11 MS. BOYD: Okay.

12 MS. FOX: (Inaudible.)

13 MS. BOYD: Yeah. I think that -- and I appreciate all
14 of your comments because, if you listened or you
15 were here Wednesday, I think a motion was made and
16 passed about the new processes starting on July 1,
17 and then the Commissioners asked about the filing
18 dates, which I was not -- I don't -- I don't walk
19 around with those in my head. But I knew Dominion
20 had filed its earlier this year.

21 If y'all don't mind, I want to ask something.
22 It's procedural; it's another jurisdiction. It's
23 my understanding all the electric -- jurisdictional
24 electric utilities in North Carolina file sometime
25 in September on one day.

1 MS. DULIN: Yeah. I can help with that. So that's

2 true. The two Duke utilities file September 1 in

3 North Carolina.

4 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

5 MS. DULIN: So our intent was, in order to streamline

6 this, is that Duke would file -- and split the

7 administrative duties on that work -- we would file

8 September 15th in South Carolina.

9 MS. BOYD: Okay.

10 MS. DULIN: That's -- that's the schedule that we intend

11 to put forward in the -- in the comments that we're

12 going to file by Wednesday.

13 MS. BOYD: Okay. Is it the same for same for Dominion

14 in North Carolina?

15 MR. BURGESS: Dominion -- I -- I don't know the answer

16 to that question.

17 MS. BOYD: Okay.

18 MR. BURGESS: So --

19 MS. BOYD: I was just -- I was talking to -- asking

20 about some procedural issues there, and they -- I

21 was instructed that all the electric utilities file

22 on one day in -- unless they ask for an extension,

23 in North Carolina, so I was -- I wanted to see if

24 you-all are opposed to that if the Commissioners --

25 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. Well, you know, I can tell you from

1 Dr. Lynch's perspective, he really likes February
2 28th.

3 MS. BOYD: Okay.

4 MR. BURGESS: And, also, too the Company engages in
5 sales forecasts and revenue requirements and -- and
6 -- and all that kind of centers around that
7 February 28 date.

8 MS. BOYD: Okay. All right.

9 MR. BURGESS: So if the Commission were to instruct us
10 to deviate from that date, it's -- there's going to
11 be an impact --

12 MS. BOYD: Okay.

13 MR. BURGESS: -- on the folks who prepare that document.

14 MS. BOYD: Okay. I just --

15 MS. SMITH: It wouldn't be the same impact to Duke
16 because it's one system.

17 MS. BOYD: Right. Right.

18 MS. SMITH: You know, especially if (inaudible).

19 MS. BOYD: Yes. Yes.

20 MS. DULIN: If we had to move to February, that would
21 be --

22 MS. BOYD: -- be -- you would have the same issue?

23 MS. DULIN: -- very difficult for us, yes.

24 MS. BOYD: Okay.

25 MS. HIPPE: And from a reviewer's perspective --

1 MS. BOYD: Right.

2 MS. HIPPI: -- the review would be harder if the date
3 were --

4 MS. BOYD: Exactly.

5 MS. HIPPI: -- set as (inaudible).

6 MS. SMITH: And -- and just to be clear on the three-
7 year clock effective in July and the way we were
8 thinking of that is that a clock by which, you
9 know, the dates start ticking --

10 MS. BOYD: Oh, yes.

11 MS. SMITH: -- for the utilities to file (inaudible).

12 So --

13 MS. BOYD: Yeah. I think -- I think that's what Vice
14 Chairman Williams meant: the three-year clock
15 would start again July 1, 2019, so the three-year
16 plans -- even if they were in the middle of an
17 annual update as of July 1, 2019, it'd start over
18 -- the three-year cycle starts again July 1, 2019.
19 Is that the way --

20 MS. SMITH: No. How we were interpreting is: whatever
21 you've got to do in three years, the timing of that
22 three-year clock starts in July, not -- not in
23 terms of applying the new processes --

24 MS. BOYD: Okay.

25 MS. SMITH: -- etc., the utilities were required to do

1 -- to make a comprehensive filing every three
2 years.

3 MS. BOYD: Right.

4 MS. SMITH: And that clock starts ticking in July. So
5 -- so the Commission still has the latitude to
6 allow this half to file at this deadline and --

7 MS. BOYD: Oh, yes. Yes. I agree with you on that.
8 But I think I meant, like, if you were -- if you,
9 Duke, were in the middle of your second year for
10 your annual update, like this year -- well, no. I
11 shouldn't say -- yeah.

12 MS. SMITH: And we are.

13 MS. BOYD: Okay. But next year you would file your
14 three-year comprehensive.

15 MS. SMITH: Yeah.

16 MS. BOYD: Yeah. That's the --

17 MS. SMITH: So we -- we'd meet the three-year
18 requirement

19 MS. BOYD: Right. That's what I meant. We were saying
20 it differently. Yeah. That's the way I understood
21 it, too. Okay.

22 MS. SMITH: I got myself turned around on it.

23 MS. BOYD: I -- I -- I -- I had the same interpretation.

24 Okay. Does anybody else -- yes, ma'am.

25 MS. FOX: (Inaudible.)

1 MS. BOYD: I don't think that's what they were --

2 MR. BURGESS: No.

3 MS. BOYD: I think they're saying that that won't take

4 place, Peg, until next year.

5 MS. FOX: After these other things. Okay.

6 MS. BOYD: Yes.

7 MS. FOX: I (inaudible).

8 MS. HIPPIE: (Inaudible.)

9 MS. FOX: (Inaudible.)

10 MR. MELCHERS: (Inaudible.)

11 MS. HIPPIE: (Inaudible.)

12 MS. BOYD: Okay. Beautiful. What else have we not

13 talked about?

14 MR. GOLDIN: Jocelyn, administratively --

15 MS. BOYD: Okay.

16 MR. GOLDIN: -- (inaudible) 58-41-20 Sub I, it is

17 required (inaudible) party --

18 MS. BOYD: Oh, yeah. Yes.

19 MR. GOLDIN: -- to provide them (inaudible) --

20 MS. BOYD: That's right.

21 MR. GOLDIN: (Inaudible.)

22 MS. BOYD: Right.

23 MR. GOLDIN: And so I just wanted to bring that to your

24 attention and make -- make sure that they're

25 excited about it and engaged.

1 MS. BOYD: Oh, yeah. We -- we're -- we've already moved
2 forward with talking to people, and they've been on
3 site, so yes. Thank you, though.

4 MR. GOLDIN: No problem.

5 MS. BOYD: Thank you. Okay.

6 MR. BURGESS: Jocelyn, that's all I have.

7 MS. BOYD: That's all you have?

8 MR. BURGESS: I mean, I --

9 MS. BOYD: Thank you. Thank you.

10 MR. BURGESS: I think we're five minutes ahead of
11 schedule. No. You had other business. I'm sorry.

12 MS. BOYD: Everybody, I wrote -- I know that the letter
13 that we talked about -- you've received the -- the
14 letter related to the --

15 MR. BURGESS: -- the IRP. I see --

16 MS. BOYD: -- IRPs, but there's another letter.

17 MR. BURGESS: Yeah. IRP and also interconnection, but
18 not voluntary renewable energy program letter.
19 I've not received that one.

20 MS. BOYD: Is the interconnection -- the
21 interconnection --

22 MR. BURGESS: That was under --

23 MS. BOYD: I can't remember, y'all. I have --

24 MR. BURGESS: Okay. I'll help you out. So --

25 MS. BOYD: The interconnection timelines, which are due

1 next week. No?

2 MR. BURGESS: The guideline for interconnection was due
3 on July 3rd or 5th. I can't recall.

4 MS. BOYD: That's right.

5 MR. BURGESS: Okay. And what's due next due next week
6 was the comments -- comments on the IRP.

7 MS. BOYD: Yes. Those are the only two. Did you
8 receive those two?

9 MS. DULIN: Yes.

10 MR. BURGESS: Okay. I got those. I just didn't get the
11 voluntary -- I think you had another one you said
12 you were going to check on.

13 MR. BURGESS: The voluntary renewable --

14 MS. BOYD: No. I have not sent that yet.

15 MR. BURGESS: Okay.

16 MS. DULIN: We have just a general question about sort
17 of how these questions are being raised. So I
18 think sometimes it's hard for utilities to start
19 planning when we hear the Commissioners making
20 motions that are adopted that set, like, a 30-day
21 deadline to file comments, and so it's hard for us
22 to determine if we need to start drafting comments
23 that would be filed in the 30 days, and -- and so
24 we don't know if the 30 days is starting to run
25 from when the motion is made --

1 MS. BOYD: Oh.

2 MS. DULIN: -- or when a letter comes out, so it might
3 be helpful if -- this is -- you know, just trying
4 to think through transparency and I don't know if
5 there's a way that, if motions are adopted in that
6 format, that we could receive notice of those in a
7 -- in a written manner.

8 MS. BOYD: (Inaudible.)

9 MS. DULIN: Yeah. So we might be able to make sure just
10 that we're all on the same page about what the
11 upcoming deadlines are -- are going to be.

12 MS. BOYD: Right.

13 MS. DULIN: Because, just for instance, if a
14 Commissioner made a motion that was adopted that
15 said we had to file something within 30 days at the
16 meeting two weeks ago --

17 MS. BOYD: Right.

18 MS. DULIN: -- but there hasn't been a letter put in the
19 docket yet, am I supposed to be filing something in
20 14 days or --

21 MS. BOYD: No. That -- that -- I know which motion
22 you're talking about. That -- I think that was the
23 solar community program, and they instructed me by
24 July 15th to open the docket, and then they -- then
25 I think Judge Ervin said and then 30 days from the

1 date of your letter.

2 MS. DULIN: Oh. Yeah. See, and that --

3 MS. BOYD: So --

4 MS. DULIN: -- kind of goes to my -- my issue about the

5 -- I guess I could go back and -- you know, I kind

6 of played it and hit rewind and played it and hit

7 rewind --

8 MS. BOYD: Right.

9 MS. DULIN: -- to try to make sure I'm getting it just

10 right, but if -- if those could come out in a

11 written form, it might help us all to know --

12 MS. BOYD: Right.

13 MS. DULIN: -- what the actual motion was that was

14 adopted. That's just a --

15 MS. BOYD: Yes.

16 MS. DULIN: -- friendly suggestion.

17 MS. BOYD: I do think, too, though if you -- also,

18 Rebecca, I think that those minutes -- that

19 transcript is on DMS, too, if you -- until we can

20 get to that point.

21 MS. DULIN: Yeah.

22 MS. BOYD: So if you are curious, I know that one's been

23 posted. And she will post the one from Wednesday.

24 MS. DULIN: Okay.

25 MS. BOYD: But we'll work on the directives.

1 MS. DULIN: Okay.

2 MS. BOYD: But, yeah, that -- that day -- yeah. He said
3 30 days from the date of my letter. Or 45.

4 MS. DULIN: Okay.

5 MS. GRUNDMANN: And does that -- I guess that -- I
6 assume that changes sometimes (inaudible), right?

7 MS. DULIN: It would just be helpful -- because I think
8 there's a 45-day at some point. And so --

9 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

10 MS. DULIN: -- did that clock start to run even though
11 there's not a -- that's on the voluntary renewable
12 program. So that was 45 days, and so -- based on
13 my note, and I hope I got it right. But, you know,
14 does that start to run on the date that the
15 motion's made so that, you know, I need to start
16 getting with my folks and start drafting that
17 stuff, or do I need to wait for a letter to come
18 out? I'm just trying to avoid --

19 MS. GRUNDMANN: Yeah.

20 MS. DULIN: -- the confusion (inaudible).

21 MS. BOYD: I think it's -- it depends on the way they
22 state it in the motion. She has the minutes for
23 that. That's -- that's -- not the minutes. The
24 transcript. It's not even the minutes. The
25 transcripts from that meeting should already be on

1 DMS.

2 MS. SMITH: And I guess just from -- I mean, just a
3 simple way to say: If the utility has a -- the
4 utility is being required to do something, we sure
5 would appreciate it in written form --

6 MS. BOYD: Uh-huh.

7 MS. SMITH: -- in the docket so that there's no
8 confusing -- no confusion.

9 MS. BOYD: Right.

10 MS. SMITH: If the parties are interested and prompts
11 them to take action, it's within the docket in
12 written form --

13 MS. BOYD: Right.

14 MS. SMITH: -- so that there's no --

15 MS. BOYD: Right.

16 MS. SMITH: -- (inaudible).

17 MS. BOYD: Yes. Okay. Are there any other issues right
18 now?

19 Okay. So I guess we'll be looking for
20 comments and any amended --

21 UNDETERMINED: (Inaudible.)

22 MS. BOYD: Oh, yeah.

23 MR. MELCHERS: Can I have your notes?

24 MR. DAVIS: Yeah. Can you take (inaudible).

25 MS. BOYD: -- any amended timelines. Okay.

1 MR. HOLMAN: Just send those to you?

2 MS. BOYD: If you would, you can send them -- yeah. If
3 you'll send them to me, and then we'll just have to
4 sort out -- and -- and copy all the parties, we'll
5 sort out which dockets to post them in. If you're
6 not sure which dockets, then we'll just have to
7 sort --

8 MR. HOLMAN: Okay.

9 MS. BOYD: -- through which dockets they're posted in.

10 MR. DAVIS: Thanks, Jocelyn.

11 MS. BOYD: Thank you.

12 UNDETERMINED: Thank you.

13 MS. BOYD: Thank you, Hamilton. Okay. Thank you,
14 everyone.

15 (Whereupon, the within meeting was
16 concluded at 11:57 a.m.)

17 (*This transcript may contain quoted material.
18 Such material is reproduced as read or quoted
19 by the speaker.)

20 (**Certificate accompanies original only.)

21

22

23

24

25